

## Stage 2 Acceptable evidence

Source: *McTighe & Wiggins (2011)*

Determining acceptable evidence involves six aspects:

### 1. Consider evidence of the understanding/s, knowledge and skills identified in Stage 1.

Think about how the learning intentions/goals established in Stage 1 can be assessed. Remember that Stage 1 learning intentions/goals included ‘Transfer’ learning intentions/goals, ‘Meaning’ learning intentions/goals and ‘Acquisition’ learning intentions/goals.

Assessing for understanding requires evidence of the student’s ability to insightfully explain or interpret their learning - to “show their work” and to “justify” or “support” their performance/product with commentary (meaning).

Assessing for understanding also requires evidence of the student’s ability to apply their learning in new, varied, and realistic situations.

### Sources of evidence

Examples of sources of evidence include:

- selected-response format (e.g., multiple-choice, true-false) quizzes and tests
- written/oral responses to academic prompts (short-answer format)
- performance assessment tasks, yielding:
  - extended written products (e.g., essays, lab reports)
  - visual products (e.g., PowerPoint, mural)
  - oral performances (e.g., oral report, foreign language dialogues)
  - demonstrations (e.g., skill performance in physical education)
- long-term, “authentic” projects (e.g., senior exhibition)
- portfolios - collections of student work over time
- reflective journals or learning logs
- informal, on-going observations of students
- formal observations of students using observable indicators or criterion list
- student self-assessments
- peer reviews and peer response groups

## 2. Design Performance task/s

Wiggins & McTighe (2011) distinguish between two broad types of assessment - Performance Tasks and Other Evidence.

Performance tasks:	Other evidence:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are culminating performances for a lesson sequence/unit. They require students to apply their learning to a new and authentic situation as means of assessing their understanding</li> <li>• reflect the 6 Facets of understanding: explanation, interpretation, application, perspective, empathy, and self-understanding</li> <li>• establish real-world contexts, demands, audiences, and purposes</li> <li>• can be written in the GRASPS format to make assessment tasks more authentic and engaging</li> <li>• are evaluated using valid criteria and indicators, reflective of not only quality performance but related to the desired results of Stage 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• can include evidence from quizzes, tests, observations, and work samples that round out the assessment picture in relation to the Stage 1 learning intentions/goals.</li> <li>• can overlap the performance-based evidence, increasing the reliability of the overall assessment (especially if the performance task was done by a group).</li> </ul>

For Performance task examples, Constructing a performance task scenario, Possible student roles and audiences, Possible products and performances, Considering student interests and task variables, refer to McTighe & Wiggins, 2011.

### 3. Consider the 6 Facets to identify needed elements of understanding

Six facets of understanding have been identified by Wiggins & McTighe (2011) for assessment purposes. The facets are intended to serve as indicators of how understanding is revealed and provide guidance as to the kinds of assessments needed to determine the extent of student understanding.

#### Facets of understanding

	<i>Students will...</i>
<b>Explanation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Explain it in their own words</li> <li>- Represent it in a different form</li> <li>- Teach it to someone else</li> <li>- Make and support an inference</li> </ul>
<b>Application</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use their learning effectively in a new situation</li> <li>- Transfer</li> </ul>
<b>Perspective</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognise different points of view</li> <li>- See the “big picture”</li> <li>- Take a critical stance</li> </ul>
<b>Self-Knowledge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Realise their strengths &amp; weaknesses</li> <li>- Recognise the limits of their own understanding</li> <li>- Reflect on their learning and actions</li> </ul>
<b>Empathy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Get “inside” another person’s feelings and world view</li> <li>- Recognise merit in the odd, unorthodox, or unfamiliar</li> </ul>
<b>Interpretation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Make meaning of a text or data set</li> <li>- See and describe patterns</li> <li>- Make new connections</li> </ul>

These six facets are intended to serve as indicators of how understanding is revealed and thus provide guidance as to the kinds of assessments needed to determine the extent of student understanding.

NB:

- a) All six facets of understanding need not be evident in assessment all of the time. In mathematics, application, interpretation, and explanation are the most natural, whereas in social studies, empathy and perspective may be added when appropriate.
- b) Performance Tasks based on one of more facets should be seen as culminating performances for a unit of study.

For examples of Brainstorming Assessment Ideas Using the Facets, Questioning for Understanding using the Facets, Designing Tasks Using the Six Facets, Generating Assessment Ideas and Using the Facets refer to McTighe & Wiggins, 2011.

#### 4. Use the GRASP elements to design authentic Performance Tasks (optional)

**GRASPS** is an acronym to help construct authentic scenarios for performance tasks:

Definition	Example stem statements <i>These could be considered when constructing a scenario for a performance task (Note: These are idea starters. Resist the urge to fill in all of the blanks.)</i>
<b>Goal:</b> the goal or challenge statement in the scenario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your task is...</li> <li>• The goal is to...</li> <li>• The problem/challenge is...</li> <li>• The obstacle(s) to overcome is (are)...</li> </ul>
<b>Role:</b> the role the student plays in the scenario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You are...</li> <li>• You have been asked to...</li> <li>• Your job is...</li> </ul>
<b>Audience:</b> the audience/client that the student must be concerned with in doing the task	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The target audience is...</li> <li>• You need to convince...</li> </ul>
<b>Situation:</b> the particular setting/context and its constraints and opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The context you find yourself in is...</li> <li>• The challenge involves dealing with...</li> </ul>
<b>Performance:</b> the specific performance or product expected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You will create a...in order to...</li> <li>• You need to develop...so that...</li> </ul>
<b>Standards &amp; Criteria for Success:</b> the standards against which the work will be will judged in the scenario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your performance needs to...</li> <li>• Your work will be judged by...</li> <li>• Your product must meet the following standards...</li> <li>• A successful result will...</li> </ul>

## 5. Identify appropriate criteria and use them to develop scoring rubrics

**Criteria:** When deciding on the criteria for ‘understanding’ performances, the challenge is to ensure that what is assessed is central to the understanding, not just what is easy to score.

It is also important to identify the separate traits of performance (e.g. a written paper can be well-organised but not informative and vice versa) to ensure that the student gets specific and valid feedback.

Finally the different types of criteria need to be considered (e.g. the quality of the understanding vs. the quality of the performance in which it is revealed).

### Different types of criteria

**Content criteria:** Describes the degree of students’ knowledge of factual information or understanding of concepts, principles, and processes.

Associated indicators: *accurate; appropriate; authentic; complete; correct; credible; explained; justified; important; in-depth; insightful; logical; makes connections; precise; relevant; sophisticated; supported; thorough; valid.*

**Process criteria:** Describes the degree of skill/proficiency. Also refers to the effectiveness of the process or method used.

Associated indicators: *careful; clever; coherent; collaborative; concise; coordinated; effective; efficient; flawless; followed process; logical/reasoned; mechanically correct; methodical; meticulous; organised; planned; purposeful; rehearsed; sequential; skilled.*

**Quality criteria:** Describes the degree of quality evident in products and performances.

Associated indicators: *attractive; competent; creative; detailed; extensive; focused; graceful; masterful; organised; polished; proficient; precise; neat; novel; rigorous; skilled; stylish; smooth; unique; well-crafted.*

**Result criteria:** Describes the overall impact and the extent to which goals, purposes, or results are achieved.

Associated indicators: *beneficial; conclusive; convincing; decisive; effective; engaging; entertaining; informative; inspiring; meets standards; memorable; moving; persuasive; proven; responsive; satisfactory; satisfying; significant; useful; understood.*

**Rubrics:** Use the following six areas and the four points within each to describe differences in degree when constructing a “first time” scoring rubric with a 4-point scale.

Once the rubric is applied, an analysis of student work will yield more precise descriptive language and/or a rubric with more gradations.

Degrees of Understanding	Degrees of Frequency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>thorough/complete</li> <li>substantial</li> <li>partial/incomplete</li> <li>misunderstanding/serious misconceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>always/consistently</li> <li>frequently/generally</li> <li>sometimes/occasionally</li> <li>rarely/never</li> </ul>
Degrees of Effectiveness	Degrees of Independence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>highly effective</li> <li>generally effective</li> <li>somewhat effective</li> <li>ineffective</li> </ul>	student successfully completes the task: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>independently</li> <li>with minimal assistance</li> <li>with moderate assistance</li> <li>only with considerable assistance</li> </ul>
Degrees of Accuracy	Degrees of Clarity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>completely accurate; all___(facts, concepts, mechanics, computations) correct</li> <li>generally accurate; minor inaccuracies do not affect overall result</li> <li>inaccurate; numerous errors detract from result</li> <li>major inaccuracies; significant errors throughout</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>exceptionally clear; easy to follow</li> <li>generally clear; able to follow</li> <li>lacks clarity; difficult to follow</li> <li>unclear; impossible to follow</li> </ul>

For further information about the Rubric Design Process and Tips for Designing Effective Scoring Tools refer to McTighe & Wiggins, 2011.

### 6. Identify the Other evidence that will be needed

Through what other evidence (e.g., quizzes, tests, academic prompts, observations, homework, journals) will students demonstrate achievement of the desired results?

How will students reflect upon and self-assess their learning?

## References

McTighe, J., & Wiggins, G. (2011). *Designing an understanding-based curriculum around common core standards*. Retrieved June 1, 2014, from <http://historyalden.wikispaces.com/file/view/McTighe+handout+11.14.11.pdf>