

*Design Parameters affecting Comparability for Performance Assessments: General Architecture*

Design Dimension	Tight	Relaxed	Loose
Portrait of a Learner	All districts use the same statewide portrait of a learner with the same competency definitions or characterizations	All districts include some common competencies in their portrait that share common definitional elements or characteristics	Districts choose the competencies in their portrait of a learner without constraints, allowing unique elements or characteristics
Performance Outcomes	All districts use the same statewide performance outcomes at the same grade levels	All districts use the same performance outcomes for the common competencies at the same or neighboring grade levels	Districts may establish and use different performance outcomes and grades or time points at which these are articulated
Performance Indicators	All districts use the same statewide performance indicators	All districts use the same performance indicators for the common competencies	Different districts use different performance indicators for similar competencies
Performance Tasks	All districts use the same statewide performance tasks with the same contexts designed according to a common design framework with no local customization	All districts use tasks that are designed according to a common design framework but are customized further to suit local contexts	Different districts use different tasks designed according to potentially different design frameworks and customized fully to local contexts
Scoring Rubrics	All student performances are evaluated with the same statewide scoring rubrics	All districts use scoring rubrics that contain common elements and/or the same rubrics for common tasks that target common competencies	Different districts use different scoring rubrics designed according to local purposes and uses
Scoring	All student work is scored by a common group of state-trained scorers, possibly supported via common automated scoring algorithms	Some student work is scored by a common group of regional or district-trained scorers, possibly supported via common automated scoring algorithms	All local student work is scored by local educators within each school or classroom, with freedom to choose various automated scoring algorithms for support

Design Dimension	Tight	Relaxed	Loose
Evaluator Training	All evaluators are trained using common materials and workshops with common quality expectations for performance	All districts implement similar protocols for teacher training although materials and expectations may differ and/or have only some teachers follow the common approach	Different districts use different approaches to training their teachers, including different approaches to ensuring quality implementation of scoring
Evaluator Monitoring	All evaluators are monitored for appropriate performance and reporting is possibly adjusted to account for systematic, undesirable trends	All evaluators in common settings are monitored for appropriate performance and reporting is possibly adjusted to account for systematic, undesirable trends	Different districts may or may not monitor rater performance and have different mechanisms for correcting systematic, undesirable trends during reporting
Reporting Approach	All districts use the same platform / data portal and/or templates for reporting on student performance that meets modern standards for accessibility and user-friendliness	All districts agree to protocols and principles for reporting but can opt out of the common templates and/or platform	Different districts use different reporting approaches with various levels of user-friendliness and accessibility supports
Data-sharing Approach	All districts share their data with the state through a common data-sharing portal	All districts agree to share key performance data but are free to use a variety of formats and supplementary variables	Different districts share different types of data in different formats, including not sharing any data
Feedback Approach	All districts use the same protocols, sets of scripts, and sample responses for providing feedback to learners	All districts agree on protocols and best practices for feedback but are free to customize feedback	Different districts take different approaches to the nature, timing, and use of formative feedback
Administration Context	All performance tasks are administered at a common milestone or time-window and in common settings to assess common performance standards or competencies	All districts agree on using common units as part of their curriculum with common tasks tied to these units and comparable settings	Different districts administer different performance tasks at the time points that make the most sense locally

*Design Parameters affecting Comparability for Performance Assessments: Specific Example in Blog*

Design Dimension	Tight	Relaxed	Loose
Portrait of a Learner	All districts use the same statewide portrait of a learner with the same competency definitions or characterizations	All districts include some common competencies in their portrait that share common definitional elements or characteristics	Districts choose the competencies in their portrait of a learner without constraints, allowing unique elements or characteristics
Performance Outcomes	All districts use the same statewide performance outcomes at the same grade levels	All districts use the same performance outcomes for the common competencies at the same or neighboring grade levels	Districts may establish and use different performance outcomes and grades or time points at which these are articulated
Performance Indicators	All districts use the same statewide performance indicators	All districts use the same performance indicators for the common competencies	Different districts use different performance indicators for similar competencies
Performance Tasks	All districts use the same statewide performance tasks with the same contexts designed according to a common design framework with no local customization	All districts use tasks that are designed according to a common design framework but are customized further to suit local contexts	Different districts use different tasks designed according to potentially different design frameworks and customized fully to local contexts
Scoring Rubrics	All student performances are evaluated with the same statewide scoring rubrics	All districts use scoring rubrics that contain common elements and/or the same rubrics for common tasks that target common competencies	Different districts use different scoring rubrics designed according to local purposes and uses
Scoring	All student work is scored by a common group of state-trained scorers, possibly supported via common automated scoring algorithms	Some student work is scored by a common group of regional or district-trained scorers, possibly supported via common automated scoring algorithms	All local student work is scored by local educators within each school or classroom, with freedom to choose various automated scoring algorithms for support

Design Dimension	Tight	Relaxed	Loose
Evaluator Training	All evaluators are trained using common materials and workshops with common quality expectations for performance	All districts implement similar protocols for teacher training although materials and expectations may differ and/or have only some teachers follow the common approach	Different districts use different approaches to training their teachers, including different approaches to ensuring quality implementation of scoring
Evaluator Monitoring	All evaluators are monitored for appropriate performance and reporting is possibly adjusted to account for systematic, undesirable trends	All evaluators in common settings are monitored for appropriate performance and reporting is possibly adjusted to account for systematic, undesirable trends	Different districts may or may not monitor rater performance and have different mechanisms for correcting systematic, undesirable trends during reporting
Reporting Approach	All districts use the same platform / data portal and/or templates for reporting on student performance that meets modern standards for accessibility and user-friendliness	All districts agree to protocols and principles for reporting but can opt out of the common templates and/or platform	Different districts use different reporting approaches with various levels of user-friendliness and accessibility supports
Data-sharing Approach	All districts share their data with the state through a common data-sharing portal	All districts agree to share key performance data but are free to use a variety of formats and supplementary variables	Different districts share different types of data in different formats, including not sharing any data
Feedback Approach	All districts use the same protocols, sets of scripts, and sample responses for providing feedback to learners	All districts agree on protocols and best practices for feedback but are free to customize feedback	Different districts take different approaches to the nature, timing, and use of formative feedback
Administration Context	All performance tasks are administered at a common milestone or time-window and in common settings to assess common performance standards or competencies	All districts agree on using common units as part of their curriculum with common tasks tied to these units and comparable settings	Different districts administer different performance tasks at the time points that make the most sense locally