ELA/Literacy Professional Development Activity
Conducting a Scoring Session Using Understanding Proficiency Tools

Overview
In this activity, participants will score student responses to a performance task in a Smarter Balanced Practice Test in order to better understand the scoring criteria and requirements for each level of the rubric.

Objectives
Participants will:
- Examine a performance task from a Smarter Balanced Practice Test and its related rubric
- Understand the criteria for each score level in one or two dimension(s) of a Smarter Balanced full-write rubric
- Map evidence in student work to language in the rubric

Time
ACTIVITY OPTION 1
- Approximately 90 minutes

ACTIVITY OPTION 2 OR 3
- Approximately 3 hours
Activity Option 1 (approximately 90 minutes)

MATERIALS & PREPARATION

Presenter Preparation:

- Select a task that is appropriate for the grade level of the teachers in your group. You can view tasks on the ELA/Literacy grade-level pages of Understanding Proficiency.
- Choose one of the three writing dimensions of the rubric: Organization and Purpose; Evidence and Elaboration (or, for narrative writing, Development and Elaboration); or Conventions.
- Prepare the following materials as separate handouts:
  1. The task prompt and texts. Use the scoring guide available on each ELA/Literacy grade-level page.
  2. Full-write rubric. These are available on each ELA/Literacy grade-level page.
  3. Level 3 student work sample (a sample scoring at the level 3 score point for the selected rubric dimension) and rationale for the writing dimension(s) you selected. These can be found in the full-write student samples on each ELA/Literacy grade-level page.
  4. 2–5 additional student work samples representing a range of scores. These can be found in the unscored student samples on each ELA/Literacy grade-level page.
  5. Score rationales for the additional samples. These can be found in the scoring key on each ELA/Literacy grade-level page.
  6. Chart for recording scores (see the last page of this document)

Participants will need:

- Highlighter and pen (one per participant)
- Smarter Balanced Practice Test performance task and full-write rubric (available in the scoring guide)
- 3–6 samples of student work representing different score levels on the rubric (one set per participant)
- Scores and score rationales for student work samples (not handed out initially)
Facilitating the Activity

Setting the Stage

(5 minutes)

Presenter says:

In this session, we will score some real student work samples from a performance task in a Smarter Balanced Practice Test. This will help us become more familiar with the scoring criteria on the rubrics that are used to evaluate students' full writes, or essays.

All of the Smarter Balanced informational/explanatory and opinion/argumentative tasks are scored along three dimensions: (1) Organization & Purpose, (2) Evidence & Elaboration, and (3) Conventions. The narrative tasks are scored similarly except that the second dimension is replaced with Development & Elaboration. We will focus on one dimension at a time today.

Orient participants to the materials they will be using during this session. At this stage, they should have the following:

- The task (scoring guide)
- The rubric
- A highlighter and pen

Review the Task

(10–20 minutes, depending on task complexity)

Presenter says:

To score student work accurately, we need a solid understanding of what the task asks students to do. In a task that requires students to select and explain evidence from texts, we also need to read the texts ourselves so that we can distinguish between the student's ideas and those that come from sources, and so that we can make a judgment about how accurately and thoroughly a student uses or explains the sources. We will begin this protocol by taking several minutes to read and annotate the task prompt and to skim the research sources.

Ask participants to:

- Read the task prompt and instructions closely, annotating for key “asks” (i.e., what the task asks students to do).
- Skim the research sources. If time is available, write a 2–3 sentence summary of each source to help distinguish them from one another.
Activity Option 1 (continued)

**Review the Rubric**  
(10 minutes)  
Presenter says:

Next, we will review the rubric carefully to look for key distinctions between score levels. Take 3–4 minutes to review the rubric. Highlight, underline, or circle the key words at each level that distinguish it from the others. Then, take 2–3 minutes to discuss your findings with a partner or small group. Finally, we’ll discuss any major questions or observations that arise during your examination of the rubric.

Give participants time to review the rubric and then field clarifying questions. If participants have questions about the meaning of the rubric language, let them know that you will address those questions more directly later, after they attempt to apply the rubric to actual samples.

Ask participants to:

- Read through the rubric. Highlight, underline, or circle key words at each score level.
- Discuss findings with a partner or small group.
- Raise major questions or observations.

**Map Evidence to Rubric Language in a Level 3 Sample**  
(15 minutes)  
Presenter says:

Now that we have a beginning understanding of the rubric itself, we’ll benchmark ourselves by examining a level 3 sample (a sample scoring at the level 3 score point on the rubric). This will give you a reference point for scoring other samples. For the rest of this session, I won’t tell you the sample’s score in advance, but this time I will so you can focus on understanding the expectations for level 3 and mapping evidence in the student response to language in the rubric.

Hand out the level 3 student work sample. Do not hand out the score rationale yet.

Presenter says:

In the following sample, highlight or otherwise mark evidence that identifies this sample as a level 3. For anything you highlight in the student work, be sure you can point to the rubric language that describes it. For anything you highlight in the rubric, be sure you can point to something in the student work to justify it.
Activity Option 1
(continued)

Ask participants to:

- Read through the level 3 sample, marking the appropriate language on the rubric to describe the sample and marking corresponding evidence in the sample itself.
- Compare markings with partner or small group and discuss.
- Raise major questions or observations to facilitator.

Presenter says:

*Now we’ll briefly review the score rationale for the level 3 sample so you can see how well aligned you were to the official score.*

Hand out the score rationale for the level 3 sample. Give participants 3–5 minutes to read the rationale and compare it to their own notes. Field any questions or major observations that emerge from this comparison.

Ask participants to:

- Read through the score rationale for the level 3 sample
- Raise major questions or observations to the facilitator

Score and Discuss 1–2 Samples
(20–30 minutes)

Presenter says:

*In this next step, you will each score [one or two] additional sample(s) independently. You should use a similar process, matching evidence in the student work sample to specific language in the rubric. Then, make a judgment about the best overall score for the sample.*

*When everyone has finished scoring the sample[s], you will use a chart to visually record your scores, then you will discuss each sample with the goal of reaching consensus on a score for each one.*

Provide the scoring chart and explain/model its use. Once participants have scored, charted, and discussed, field any questions or observations that they have.
Activity
Option 1
(continued)

Ask participants to:

- Independently score 1–2 samples at any level (facilitator does not disclose score until later), matching evidence in the student sample to language in the rubric.
- Chart scores to compare to peers; discuss with the goal of reaching consensus on each score using evidence in the student work sample.
- Raise major questions or observations to the facilitator.

Review Score Rationales
(10–15 minutes)
Distribute the score rationales for the samples.

Presenter says:

Now that you have had a chance to score and discuss the samples, we will review the "official" scores and score rationales for each sample. Read through each one and note any questions or observations that arise for you, including anything that either clarifies or raises questions about the scoring criteria themselves or about how the rationale uses evidence from the student work to justify the score.

Give participants up to 10 minutes to read through the rationales. Field any questions and observations that arise.

Ask participants to:

- Read through the score rationales
- Note questions or observations
- Raise questions and observations to facilitator
Activity Option 1 (continued)

Reflect on the Process
(5 minutes)
Presenter says:

To conclude, we’ll reflect on the experience we just had. Please take 3 minutes to jot down a brief reflection. Some questions you may want to consider are

- What was difficult about scoring these samples?
- What did you notice about your own scoring process?
- What will you take away from this experience? Did you have any “aha” moments?
- Does this experience have any implications for your instruction?

Give participants 3 minutes to write silently; then invite a few participants to share out some thoughts from their reflections.

Ask participants to:

- Write a brief informal reflection using the guiding questions above.
- Share thoughts with the group (optional).
If you have three hours, you could extend the first activity in two different ways:

**Option 2** — Follow the directions for the 90-minute activity, and then repeat with a second scoring dimension.

**Option 3** — Follow the same general directions for Activity option 1, but have participants score a larger set of student work along a single dimension. Follow the same procedure as in Option 1, having participants score, chart, discuss, and then review score rationales for each sample. Use this opportunity to expose participants to samples at all four score levels.

Additionally, in the 3-hour session, to orient participants to the process of evidence-based scoring, consider playing the video called *Gathering Evidence and Scoring Using Smarter Balanced Rubrics* in the ELA/Literacy Video Library; there are two versions, one for elementary teachers and one for secondary teachers.

**Ideas for Next Steps**

* In a separate session, you could revisit these same samples with an instructional lens to have teachers plan feedback they would give and/or plan instructional next steps that would help students develop the skills identified in the rubric.

* If your teachers were helping students to prepare for the Smarter Balanced summative assessment, you could have them use a similar activity with students to help students become deeply familiar with the rubric and to reflect on their own work in light of the criteria.
Conducting a Scoring Session Using Understanding Proficiency Tools

**Example of a Score Chart**

*Facilitator Note:* For whole group discussions, replicate this chart on large paper or a whiteboard and have all participants chart their scores using markers. For small group/table discussions, replicate this chart on a piece of 8.5 x 11” paper for each table.

In either context, participants should “chart” their scores for each sample using simple tally marks. This will provide a concrete visual of the distribution of initial scores from the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example of a Completed Row**

In this example, three participants assigned a score of “2” to Sample 1, and one participant assigned a score of “3.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample 1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>