

## Lesson Plan Assessment Rubric

**CAEP Standard/Component:** 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.5, & technology cross-cutting theme

**InTASC Standards:** 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

**ETSU Clemmer College Framework:** 1-8

### **Administration and Purpose**

- a. Points of Administration-** For undergraduate students’ knowledge about the lesson plan template, its components, and its associated assessment rubric are introduced, but not assessed, in EDFN 2400- *Foundations of Professional Teaching*, which is the entry level teacher education course required for all candidates at ETSU. ETSU do not assess the lesson plan (or use the assessment rubric) the 2000 level, due to the numerous amounts of candidates who transfer from multiple community colleges where this course is often taken. The lesson plan is re/introduced and assessed for Data Point I in Early Field courses specific to each program (see Table 1. Lesson Plan Data Collection Timetable for specific courses). During the Residency I and Residency II classes, teacher candidates complete a year-long residency (Pre-Residency, Residency I and Residency II) where the entire lesson plan is taught and assessed for Data Points II & III (see Table 1. Lesson Plan Data Collection Timetable for specific courses).

At the graduate level, the lesson plan guidelines, template, and rubric are introduced in program specific introductory courses (see Table 1. Lesson Plan Data Collection Timetable). In addition, teacher candidates upload the complete lesson plan through LiveText for the second evaluation and data point collection during Residency I & Residency II.

**Table 1**

*Lesson Plan Data Collection Timetable*

| UNDERGRADUATE INITIAL LICENSURE COURSES |  |                                    |                             |                               |
|---|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Licensure Programs                      | INTRODUCTORY (introductory learning opportunity) | Data Point I (Early Field Courses) | Data Point II (Residency I) | Data Point III (Residency II) |
| ECED PreK-3                             | EDFN 2400  | ECED 3210                          | ECED 4680                   | ECED 4780                     |
| ELEM K-5                                | EDFN 2400  | CUAI 3500                          | CUAI 4241                   | CUAI 4590                     |
| SPED                                    | EDFN 2400  | SPED 3300                          | SPED 4710                   | SPED 4850                     |
| PE                                      | EDFN 2400  | PEXS 4007                          | PEXS 4717                   | PEXS 4850                     |
| Secondary                               |  | READ 4437                          | CUAI 4426                   | CUAI 4580                     |
| Art                                     |  |                                    |                             |                               |
| Music                                   |  |                                    |                             |                               |

| GRADUATE LEVEL INITIAL LICENSURE COURSES |  |                                    |                             |                               |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Licensure Programs                       | INTRODUCTORY (introductory learning opportunity) | Data Point I (Early Field Courses) | Data Point II (Residency I) | Data Point III (Residency II) |
| MAT – Middle Grades                      | EDFN 5420  | EDFN 5420                          | CUAI 5458                   | CUAI 5570                     |
| MAT - Secondary                          | EDFN 5420  | EDFN 5420                          | CUAI 5438                   | CUAI 5580                     |
| MAT – Job-Embedded                       | EDFN 5420  | EDFN 5420                          | CUAI 5590                   | CUAI 5590                     |
| SLIB M.Ed.                               |  |                                    |                             |                               |
| ECED MA                                  | ECED 5440  | ECED 5440                          | ECED 5617                   | ECED 5580                     |
| SPED M.Ed.                               |  | SPED 5301                          | SPED 5710                   | SPED 5580                     |

**b. Purpose of Assessment & Use in Candidate Monitoring or Decisions on Progression-** The lesson plan assessment rubric is designed to assess candidates’ understandings of the essential components involved in planning to assure student learning and curriculum relevance. Within certain courses, earlier in the program, the focus is on planning versus the actual teaching of the lesson. The lesson plans linked to clinical experiences applications and clinical practice application extend the assessment purpose by examining candidates’ analysis of student learning and reflection about concrete next steps in planning. The lesson plan assessment rubric components and rubric items are tagged and aligned to CAEP, InTASC, and reflect the EPP’s conceptual framework and beliefs.

**c. Instructions Provided to Candidates about what they are Expected to do are Informative and Unambiguous-** The lesson plan, and its associated rubric, are first introduced to undergraduate teacher education students in EDFN 2400- *Foundations of Professional Teaching*, which is the entry level teacher education course required for all candidates at ETSU. Teacher candidates are introduced to the following components on the lesson plan template and rubric at this 2000 level: (a) curriculum standards, (b) essential question, (c) lesson objective(s), (d) assessment/evaluation (informal/formative and formal/summative), (e) instruction set/motivator, (f) instructional procedures and learning tasks, (g) questions and/or activities for higher order thinking, (h) closure, (i) materials/resources, and (j) technology.

At the same time the students are introduced to the lesson plan template, students review the associated rubric. The rubric was developed by the CAEP team (with input and feedback from faculty and LEA partners) with actionable language for each assessment criteria. The actionable language allows the students to understand the expectations of them when developing their lesson plan and removes ambiguous

language with the intention of being clear to the students how they can score at each of the criteria levels. An example of actionable language from the lesson plan rubric can be seen in Figure 1.

**Figure 1**

*Sample Assessment Item from the Lesson Plan Assessment Rubric*

| Category   | Below Expectation  | Meets Expectation   | Exemplary   |
|--|--|---|---|
| <b>INSTRUCTION – SET/MOTIVATOR</b><br>Candidate creates a set/motivator that restates and addresses the essential question and engages student interest in the content of the lesson, relates to previous learning, and uses knowledge of students’ academic, social, and cultural characteristics. It includes what the teacher will do and what students are expected to do.<br><br>CAEP 1.1<br>INTASC 7 | Set/Motivator is missing or does not raise interest toward essential question, I can statement, objective(s), unclear what teacher and/or students will do.<br><br><b>OR</b><br><br>Fails to meet the level of ‘Meets Expectation’ | <b>Set/Motivator engages student interest and connects with the essential question (I can statement), or objective(s), explaining what teachers will do and what students are expected to do.</b> | Set/Motivator engages student interest and connects with the essential question, I can statement, objective(s), explaining what teachers will do and what students are expected to do, <b>AND plans for prompting links to previous learning and uses that knowledge of students’ academic, social, and cultural characteristics.</b> |

The instructor of EDFN 2400 evaluates the lesson plan using the lesson plan rubric. ETSU shares the lesson plan template and rubrics with instructors who teach the same course at community colleges where we have articulation agreements. Since we do not have access and control over the assessments used at the community college level we have designed this introduction in EDFN 2300 as a learning opportunity rather than an assessment where data is collected for accreditation purposes.

At the graduate level, the lesson plan guidelines, template, and rubric are introduced in program specific introductory courses. Candidates are introduced to the lesson plan guidelines, template and full assessment rubric.

- d. **Criteria for Success-** A three-level rubric was selected based on seeking to understand about the opinions/perceptions of participants related with single ‘latent’ variable (i.e, teaching planning actions). “Here during analysis, the scores of the all items of the questionnaire are combined (sum) to generate a composite score.” (Joshi, et al., 2015)

The CAEP leadership developed a scoring criterion in conjunction with based on two focus groups and field pretests with LEA partners, both of which took place in the spring of 2018 (Groves et al., 2011).

Field pretests are a validity procedure that are small scale rehearsals, that are used to “evaluate the rubric as well as the data collection and respondent selection procedures” (Groves et al., 2011, p. 265). The field pre-tests were completed by selected LEA partners prior to their participation in the on-campus focus group. The first piloted version of the assessment rubric had participants (ETSU faculty, supervisors, and LEA partners) respond to teacher planning actions behaviors (i.e., indicators) on a 3-point assessment scale based on their level of agreement in evidence from the provided lesson plan teacher (3- exemplary, 2- meets expectation, 1- below expectation) (see Figure 1).

The CAEP committee, with feedback from LEA partners, decided that scores will be analyzed based on each individual rubric assessment item, as they represent their own construct related lesson planning. Thus, all partners were in agreement that the rubric scores would not be added up for a total cumulative score. In addition, in the fall of 2018, CAEP committee and LEA partners reviewed rubric and survey literature, feedback from EPP and LEA partners, and best practices in assessment of teacher education candidates from edTPA planning literature, and determined that the coding of the non-numeric responses in our survey should be evaluated on a three-point assessment rubric scale.

Criteria for Analyzing ETSU End of Program Survey Data (On a 3-point scale):

1. Program Target Score = Score of 2
2. Program Strength = Score of Above 2
3. Program Area of Need = Score of Below 2

Groves, R. M., Fowler Jr, F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2011). *Survey methodology* (Vol. 561). John Wiley & Sons.

Joshi, et al. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 396-403.

- e. **Evaluation Categories Aligned to CAEP, InTASC, National/Professional & State Standards-** The assessment rubric’s components and statements (i.e., latent variables) are tagged and aligned specifically to CAEP, InTASC, and reflect the EPP’s conceptual framework and beliefs. The assessment rubric content was co-developed with LEA partners based on the language from the 10 InTASC standards and from planning literature related to edTPA.

**Content of Assessment**

**a. Indicators Assess Explicitly Identified Aspects of CAEP, InTASC, National/Professional & State Standards-** Statements and components of the lesson plan assessment rubric are explicitly identified and aligned to the language in the 10 InTASC standard progression levels. In addition to the direct InTASC standard alignment this, EPP created instrument aligns with the following CAEP standards 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.5, & technology cross-cutting theme, and all of the attributes of the Clemmer College Conceptual Framework. As of July 2018, CAEP and the Tennessee Department of Education entered a formal agreement where Tennessee EPP programs will have to align to the CAEP standards at the state level. “The CAEP Board of Directors (CAEP Board or Board) and the SBE have adopted standards (CAEP Standards or Standards) that serve as the basis for all EPP accreditation and state approval reviews undertaken by CAEP. The CAEP Standards reflect the voice of the education field on what makes a quality educator” (CAEP, 2018). As a result, the alignment to the CAEP and InTASC standards represents fulfillment of the EPP requirements at the state level.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation- CAEP (2018). *Tennessee Department of Education and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation Partnership Agreement.*

<http://caepnet.org/working-together/~media/Files/caep/state-partners/tn-partnership-agreement-unsigned.pdf?la=en>

**b. Indicators reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards-** The lesson plan assessment rubric will provide statements to the evaluators related to a candidate’s ability to plan a lesson that demonstrates the selected best practice in instruction, assessment, and meeting the needs of diverse learners. For each of the teacher planning actions (i.e., indicators), evaluators will be asked to evaluate on a 3-point assessment scale based on their level of agreement in evidence from the provided lesson plan teacher (3- exemplary, 2- meets expectation, 1- below expectation). Each of the lesson plan assessment items has actionable qualitative descriptors so both evaluators and candidates clearly understand expectations needed to meet each rubric level.

**c. Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated-** Rubric development research states that the instrument must have evaluators respond to each individual item based on item specificity, or one specific teacher planning actions for each item, and avoids question prompts that address global behaviors (DeVellis, 2016; Saris, et al., 2010).

Prompts/indicators (i.e., latent variables) describe the proficiencies to be evaluated, have a single subject and are stated in terms of behaviors or practices directly derived from the InTASC standards. In addition, each of the indicators were specifically designed so that scoring is anchored in the teaching planning actions related to teaching education best practices. The CAEP committee, with feedback from LEA partners, reviewed and edited rubric items to remove double-barreled and ambiguous wording (DeVellis, 2016).

DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Vol. 26). Sage publications.

Saris, W., Revilla, M. A., Krosnick, J. A., & Shaeffer, E. M. (2010). Comparing questions with agree/disagree response options to questions with construct-specific response options. *Survey Research Methods*. 2010; 4 (1): 61-79.

- d. Indicators require higher levels of intellectual behaviors-** Each rubric item (indicator) on the lesson plan assessment rubric was written to address teaching performance behaviors of the InTASC standards. Each of the InTASC standards were developed to maintain the specific delineation between knowledge, dispositions, and performances related to teaching behaviors (CCSSO, 2013). For example, InTASC standard #2, which addresses understanding diverse learner needs, has indicators related to performance, essential knowledge, and dispositions. The CCSSO (2013) has specifically noted that the *performance* indicator has been “put first, as the aspect can be observed and assessed in teaching practice” (p. 6), as compared to that of *knowledge* and *dispositions*.

Each of the rubric items (indicators) use specific language from the InTASC standards in association with teacher performance behaviors. The lesson plan assessment rubric was developed to meet the highest possible level of Bloom’s taxonomy (Krathwol, 2002) of cognition.

Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO] (2013, April). *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0: A resource for ongoing teacher development*. Washington, DC: Author.

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(4), 212-218.

- e. Indicators require consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies-** Because nearly all rubric items are a direct derivative of the language in the InTASC standards, the lesson plan assessment rubric meets,

and potentially exceeds, the minimal sufficient level. The minimal sufficient level to meet this CAEP sub-standard is that at least 80% indicators require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in InTASC standards, and 95% is deemed above expectation.

## **Scoring**

- a. **Basis for judging candidate performance-** The lesson plan assessment rubric differentiates between three levels of performance – *exemplary* (3), *meets expectation* (2), and *below expectation* (1). The performance indicators are based upon criteria and language found in the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0 (2013). This release stipulates that the InTASC standards no longer apply to only “beginning” teachers but are instead intended as “professional practice standards” (p. 6). Therefore, these standards and the associated learning progressions describe a teacher’s professional development throughout his or her career.

It is not expected to see a large number of *exemplary* ratings in early field experience. Rather it would be expected to see development across experiences with students earning more *below expectation* and *meets expectation* ratings in earlier phases and progressing toward *meets expectation* and *exemplary* in later phases. Furthermore, these ratings are based upon expectations for teacher candidates who are still in our programs. Based upon this assumption, an *exemplary* rating is one that most of our teacher candidates are expected to achieve by the completion of their residency II. Ratings of *exemplary* should only be awarded to the teacher candidates who can consistently and independently demonstrate exemplary classroom planning per the rubric evaluation categories.

The rating levels do not translate into A – F grades. Instead, the rubrics are designed to generate data that will reveal patterns of student performance at various stages of development across the learning progressions. These data are intended to guide continual improvement of our preparation of teachers. All candidates perform differently. However, it is expected that on most indicators, those in early field experience typically would be rated at the *satisfactory* level and progress to the *exemplary* level by the end of their residency II experience.

- b. **Qualitative definition of proficiency level descriptors (PLD) by specific criteria aligned with indicators-** The lesson plan assessment rubric differentiates between three levels of performance – *exemplary* (3), *meets expectation* (2), and *below expectation* (1). Rust et al. (1994, pp. 61-62) claimed that an expectations question provides more accurate results than the typical performance rating or satisfaction

question by greatly reducing the 'top box' problem. They felt that one serious problem with performance scales is that oftentimes they are worded so that it is easiest for consumers to choose the top box. However, with an expectations question subjects are less likely to check the top box unless they are truly delighted rather than merely satisfied with the stimulus. Only customers who are truly delighted with a product are likely to use it in the future and/or recommend it to others. This suggests that an expectations scale should produce a mean that is different, and probably lower, than the other scales.

All rubric items had actionable based qualitative descriptors for each level that were developed through the collaboration of ETSU faculty, supervisors, and LEA partners. The qualitative descriptors spell out what is expected of students at each level of performance for each criterion. The qualitative descriptors tell the teacher candidates more precisely what performance looks like at each level and how their work may be distinguished from the work of others for each criterion. Similarly, the descriptors help the evaluator more precisely and consistently distinguish between student work

Rust, R. T., A. J. Zahorik, and T. L. Keiningham (1994), *Return on Quality*. Chicago: Probus Publishing Company.

- c. **Performance level descriptors (PLD) represent developmental sequence form level to level-** The performance level descriptors of the lesson plan assessment rubric were developed to better communicate expectations of teacher candidate planning, and the levels of performance permit the evaluator to more consistently and objectively distinguish between good and bad performance, or between superior, mediocre and poor performance, when evaluating the candidate's lesson plan.
- d. **Feedback provided to candidates is actionable-** The lesson plan assessment rubric has specific levels of performance that allows the evaluator to provide more detailed feedback to teacher candidates, thus allowing actionable and clearly defined expectations and areas for improvement. The feedback from the assessment rubric allow the evaluator and the teacher candidate can more clearly recognize areas that need improvement.

For example, if the teacher candidate performs at the *below expectation* level on any lesson plan component, residency course instructors (or supervisors) provide additional instruction for remediation with the expectation that teacher candidate must score at the *meets expectation* or above on all components in order to pass the class. In addition, course instructors report teacher candidates who score *below*

*expectation* on any component(s) of the lesson plan to program coordinators who then meet individually with the teacher candidate to discuss expectations for growth and design a development plan that includes required participation in college-wide workshops that target specific aspects of lesson planning.

- e. **Proficiency level attributes are defined in actionable, performance-based terms-** All language in the lesson plan assessment rubric was developed with actionable language to better communicate expectations of teacher candidate planning, and the levels of performance permit the evaluator to more consistently and objectively distinguish between good and bad performance, or between superior, mediocre and poor performance, when evaluating the candidate's lesson plan.

### **Data Reliability**

- a. **Description or plan is provided and details the type of reliability that is being investigated-**

According to the CAEP initial handbook, reliability is defined as “The degree to which test scores for a group of test takers are consistent over repeated applications of a measurement procedure and hence are inferred to be dependable and repeatable for an individual test taker” (CAEP, 2018, p. 119). A test is reliable if it produces a consistent measure of the information or skill in question. A test's reliability can be determined by several different methods: test-retest, split-half, Kuder-Richardson formula, and Cronbach's Alpha. An instrument's reliability is estimated based upon a numerical indicator, the reliability coefficient. Scores for the reliability coefficient range from 0 to 1.0, where 1.0 reliability equates to 100% reliability (Gay & Airasian, 2003).

The CAEP team employed criterion-related reliability measures consisting of:

1. Yearly training of lesson plan assessment rubric items for faculty, clinical instructors, and residency supervisors by the Office of Educator Preparation.
2. The evaluation of yearly inter-rater reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha), used to assess the degree to which different raters/observers give consistent estimates of the same phenomenon (i.e., internal consistency). This was done through a yearly uniform lesson plan calibration assessment sent out to all faculty and associated supervisors.
3. Initial establishment and evaluation of longitudinal data of showing stability and consistency of raters' agreement over time.

Gay, L. R. & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. Pearson Education, Inc.

**b. Training of scorers and checking on inter-rater agreement and reliability are documented.**

1. Fall 2018-

- i. *Initial Lesson Plan Rubric Training & Pilot-* In September of 2018 an all-Clemmer College teacher education meeting was held to for teacher education faculty. The purpose of this meeting was to (a) describe the purpose of the new rubric (b) discuss the differences between rubric and lesson plan (c) have an open discussion about the changes made to rubric in 2018 (d) review the lesson plan rubric assessment procedures. In addition, all in attendance were given two fully completed sample lesson plans to score using the new assessment rubric. All attendees scored each lesson plan within the meeting, and answers were discussed out loud as a group, one item at a time. All score sheets were collected.

2. Fall 2019-

- i. *Lesson Plan Rubric Training-* Prior to the academic year, the Office of Educator Preparation provided faculty, clinical instructors, and residency supervisors with updated information related the lesson plan, any changes or additions to the language in the lesson plan, and a review of the assessment scoring rubric components and scoring criteria. This information was disseminated on first contact via email. In addition, the same information is reviewed and discussed in detail at all of the of the first fall faculty meetings, and the yearly meetings for clinical instructors and residency supervisors.
- ii. *Lesson Plan Calibration (Internal Consistency)-* In the fall of 2019, one standardized lesson plan was sent out to all teacher education faculty and clinical instructors. All participants were asked to score the same lesson plan independently. The following directions are sent out to all participants:

*Clemmer College Teacher Educators,*

*As part of the accreditation process, key assessments are used for data collection to demonstrate growth and quality teacher preparation. The lesson plan evaluation rubric is an essential key assessment within our quality assurance system for the CAEP accreditation process. For each of our key assessments, we must report how we continue to maintain validity and reliability. We are requesting that each teacher education faculty member and supervisor score one sample lesson plan using our current lesson plan rubric to establish inter-rater reliability (Gwet, 2012). Your participation is essential to the accreditation process.*

*Directions:*

*Please open/download the provided sample lesson plan Lesson Plan for Fall 2020*

*Upon opening the sample lesson plan, proceed to the succeeding pages of this survey to score the sample lesson plan using our current assessment rubric*

*Your score is only being used for inter-rater reliability and is not a reflection on your ability to teach/assess. If you have any questions please contact Dr. Cindy Chambers at chamberc@etsu.edu. We greatly appreciate your time and assistance.*

*The Clemmer CAEP Team*

An analysis of internal consistency for the fall 2019 had a total of 27 faculty and clinical instructors complete the lesson plan calibration. The inter-item correlation analysis suggested a positive and high correlation among the items within each subscale and all items within the instrument. The Lesson Plan Rubric consisted of 17 items with a high internal consistency ( $\alpha = .80$ ). Cohen (1960) suggested the Kappa result be interpreted as follows: values  $\leq 0$  as indicating no agreement and 0.01–0.20 as none to slight, 0.21–0.40 as fair, 0.41–0.60 as moderate, 0.61–0.80 as substantial, and 0.81–1.00 as almost perfect agreement. The results of this analysis and data will be used to inform revisions and administration of the instruments in the 2020-2021 Academic Year. The validity and reliability processes will be guided by the CAEP Instrument Rubric and the CAEP Evidence Guide.

3. Fall 2020-

- i. *Lesson Plan Assessment Rubric Training-* Prior to the academic year, the Office of Educator Preparation provided faculty, clinical instructors, and residency supervisors with updated information related the lesson plan, any changes or additions to the language in the lesson plan, and a review of the assessment scoring rubric components and scoring criteria. This information was disseminated on first contact via email. In addition, the same information is reviewed at all of the fall faculty meetings, and the yearly meetings for clinical instructors and residency supervisors.

*Lesson Plan Calibration (Internal Consistency)-* An analysis of internal consistency for the fall 2020 had a total of 29 faculty and clinical instructors complete the lesson plan

calibration. The inter-item correlation analysis suggested a positive and high correlation among the items within each subscale and all items within the instrument. The Lesson Plan Rubric consisted of 17 items with a high internal consistency ( $\alpha = .65$ ). Cohen (1960) suggested the Kappa result be interpreted as follows: values  $\leq 0$  as indicating no agreement and 0.01–0.20 as none to slight, 0.21–0.40 as fair, 0.41–0.60 as moderate, 0.61–0.80 as substantial, and 0.81–1.00 as almost perfect agreement. The results of this analysis and data will be used to inform revisions and administration of the instruments in the 2020-2021 Academic Year. The validity and reliability processes will be guided by the CAEP Instrument Rubric and the CAEP Evidence Guide.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 20(1), 37-46.

Landis, J. R. & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33, 159-174

- c. **The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing reliability-** Rubrics are used widely in higher education (Reddy & Andrade, 2010) to support teaching and learning through formative assessment (Andrade & Du, 2005), to improve student performance (Petkov & Petkova, 2006; Reitmeier, Svendsen & Vrchota, 2004), and to contribute to program improvement (Dunbar, Brooks, & Kubicka-Miller, 2006; Knight, 2006). All rubrics were developed with input from ETSU teacher education faculty in addition to feedback from LEA partners, and materials (both lesson plans and associated rubric) are reviewed yearly in the beginning of the year. Finally, inter-rater reliability agreement has been widely regarded as acceptable evidence to support reality in rubric development (Moskal & Leydens, 2000). Thus, the described reliability methodology used with the lesson plan assessment rubric is deemed acceptable and appropriate by current research standards.

### **Data Validity**

- a. **A description or plan is provided that details the steps the EPP has taken (or is taking) to ensure the validity of the assessment and its use.** The CAEP Initial Accreditation Handbook defines validity as “the extent to which a set of operations, test, or other assessment measures that it is supposed to measure. Validity is not a property of a data set but refers to the appropriateness of inferences from test scores or other forms of assessment and the credibility of the interpretations that are made concerning the findings of a measurement effort” (CAEP, 2018, p. 121). Both quantitative and qualitative validity procedures were used as evidence to support the development of the Lesson Plan Assessment Rubric.

The quantitative validity methodology that was used was the Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio. The content evaluation panel consisted of eighteen (18) faculty members with experience and expertise in elementary and secondary education. Each panel member was given the list of indicators/elements of the lesson plan rubric and asked to rate the item as "absolutely essential", "very important", "low importance", or "not important at all" in order to establish the content validity ratio (CVR). The equation guiding the calculations was:  $CVR = (ne - n/2) / (n/2)$ , with "ne" serving as the number of panelists indicating the criterion was "essential". According to Ayre and Sally (2014), the minimum CVR critical value for 18 panelists is 0.444 to establish content validity of an instrument. The total CVR value for the overall lesson plan assessment rubric was 0.65, with 18 of the 20 individual assessment variables all having CRV values greater than .444. The two variables that fell below the .444 CVR threshold were removed from future versions (see Table 2). Based on the findings, the EPP is confident that the Lesson Plan is a valid instrument for candidates

**Table 2**

*Lawshe Content Validity Ratio for Lesson Plan Assessment Rubric (18 Experts)*

| Rubric Item  | Expert Number |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                              |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | Average | CVR   |
|--|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------|-------|
|  | 1             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9                            | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |         |       |
| Knowing your learners  |               | X | X | X | X | X | X |   | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  |    | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.17    | 0.67  |
| Assessment/Eval-Modifications  | X             | X |   | X | X |   | X | X | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.33    | 0.78  |
| Instruction- Meeting individual needs and group needs/learning styles    | X             |   | X | X | X | X | X |   | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.61    | 0.78  |
| Management issues  | X             |   | X |   | X |   | X | X |                              | X  | X  |    | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 3.83    | 0.44  |
| Curriculum Standards   | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.78    | 1.00  |
| AL- Function and product of lesson                                       |               |   |   | X | X | X | X |   | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  |    | X  | X  | X  | X  | 3.78    | 0.44  |
| AL- Academic content and vocab   | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.39    | 1.00  |
| AL- Syntax/Discourse   | X             |   |   | X | X |   | X |   | X                            | X  |    |    | X  | X  |    |    | X  | X  | 3.33    | 0.11  |
| AL- Language Theory and Rationale  |               |   | X |   | X |   |   |   |                              |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | X  |    | 2.33    | -0.67 |
| Instruction- Questions for Higher order thinking                         | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X |   | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.22    | 0.89  |
| Essential Questions  | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X                            | X  |    | X  | X  |    |    |    | X  |    | 4.00    | 0.44  |
| Lesson Objectives and student learning outcomes                          | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.78    | 1.00  |
| Assessment- Informal/Formative   | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X |   | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.61    | 0.89  |
| Assessment- Formal/Summative   | X             |   | X | X | X | X | X | X | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.61    | 0.89  |
| Assessment- Academic Feedback  |               | X | X | X | X |   | X |   | X                            |    | X  | X  | X  |    | X  | X  | X  | X  | 3.78    | 0.44  |
| Instruction- Set Motivator   | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.50    | 1.00  |
| Instruction- Instructional procedures and learning tasks                 | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.67    | 1.00  |
| Instruction- Closure   | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X |   | X                            | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | 4.39    | 0.89  |
| Materials/Resources/Tech   | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X                            |    | X  |    |    | X  | X  |    | X  | X  | 4.00    | 0.56  |
| Writing Clarity  | X             | X | X | X | X | X | X |   | X                            | X  |    |    |    | X  | X  | X  | X  |    | 3.78    | 0.44  |
| <b>Key</b>   |               |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | <b>Total Lesson Plan CVR</b> |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |         |       |
| X = Rubric Item Deemed Absolutely Essential or Very Important by Experts |               |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 0.65                         |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |         |       |

Ayre, C., & Scally, A. J. (2014). Critical values for Lawshe’s content validity ratio: Revisiting the original methods of calculation. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 47(1), 79-86.

Qualitative validity procedures were used to address content validity. The CAEP committee first met and began to develop the first version of the lesson plan assessment rubric in the fall of 2016. The following sections presents a timeline and evidence to support the qualitative content validity procedures established by the CAEP committee.

1. October-December 2016- Feedback from teacher preparation faculty from within ETSU noted that there was a great deal of variability in lesson plan content and structure based on program and licensure area. The CAEP committee determined the need for a uniform lesson plan format shared by all teacher licensure areas, and for development of an associated assessment scoring rubric.

2. May 2017- Two initial retreats were held with EPP faculty and selected LEA partners to inductively reflect on behaviors and pedagogy essential for teacher preparation. As well as how well the inductive approaches aligned with the InTASC standards (Tuesday 5/9/2017 & Monday 5/22/17; ETSU Valleybook Campus, Gray, TN). The retreats were lead and attended by all CAEP committee members.
3. June 2017- Drs. Keith and Evanshen created first draft of lesson plan assessment rubric as well as guidelines for assessment use. Feedback was provided by CAEP committee.
4. Fall 2017- Based on feedback from University Supervisors, the CAEP committee decided that the rubric was quite large and needed to find essential items
5. December 2017- All lesson plan rubric items were sent out to Clemmer teacher education faculty. Faculty were asked to rank how each rubric aligned to each of the four major InTASC standard categories (Learner & Learning, Content Understanding, Instructional Practices, and Professional Responsibility).
6. February 2018- All lesson plan rubric items were sent out to Clemmer teacher education faculty. Faculty were asked to rank how essential each rubric item was to ALL teacher education programs. Results of survey eliminated some rubric items.
7. May 2018- the updated survey was sent out to all Clemmer teacher education faculty for open feedback. Drs. Evanshen and Keith reviewed qualitative feedback.
8. May 2018- LEA partners met and reviewed content of lesson plan assessment. Feedback was provided on language and essential components (Drs. O'Neil and Chambers facilitated meeting).
9. July 2018- CAEP committee decided to add a technology component to both the lesson plan and assessment rubric.
10. August 2018- CAEP committee held meeting with all teacher prep faculty and supervisors to review changes to the rubric. All present were asked to provide feedback in a town hall style. All present were asked to complete a pilot lesson plan calibration that had them score a full rubric. Those not in attendance were sent a link to complete the calibration online.
11. August 2018- CAEP committee met to go over calibration data and to make changes to the assessment rubric.
12. Fall 2018- The lesson plan rubric was brought to fall LEA meetings for feedback.
13. Fall 2019- All teacher prep faculty and supervisors completed a lesson plan calibration where all scored the same rubric.
14. Spring 2020- Lesson plan calibration data was analyzed by CAEP for internal consistency.

15. Spring 2020- Feedback from departments led CAEP committee review and revise some of the language in the rubric related to assessment (formative vs summative & formal and informal language was combined)
16. Spring 2020- Revised language of lesson plan and its associated rubric were presented to LEA partner meetings for feedback.
17. Fall 2020- All teacher prep faculty and supervisors completed a lesson plan calibration where all scored the same rubric.
18. Fall 2020- Lesson plan calibration data was analyzed by CAEP for internal consistency

b. **The plan details the types of validity that are under investigation (or have been established) and how they were established-** The validity plan described uses both quantitative and qualitative forms of content validity procedures to provide evidence to support strong validity of the lesson plan assessment rubric. According to Moskal & Leydens (2000) “Since establishing validity is dependent on the purpose of the assessment, researchers should clearly state what they hope to learn about the behaviors (i.e., the purpose) and how the teacher behaviors will display these proficiencies (i.e., the objectives). The researcher should use the stated purpose and objectives to guide the development of the scoring rubric” (p.3).

Moskal, B. M., & Leydens, J. A. (2000). Scoring rubric development: Validity and reliability. *Practical assessment, research, and evaluation*, 7(1), 10.

c. **If the assessment is new or revised, a pilot was conducted-** After receiving feedback from ETSU faculty and supervisors (2017 & 2018), and LEA partners (fall 2018), the lesson plan assessment rubric was piloted at individual department meetings (fall 2018), and in an all-Clemmer College meeting for teacher education faculty (fall 2018). Prior to the 2018 academic year, the Office of Educator Preparation provided faculty, clinical instructors, and residency supervisors with updated information related the lesson plan, any changes or additions to the language in the lesson plan, and a review of the assessment scoring rubric components and scoring criteria. This information was disseminated on first contact via email. In addition, the same information is reviewed and discussed in detail at all of the of the first fall faculty meetings, and the yearly meetings for clinical instructors and residency supervisors.

d. **The EPP details its current process (or plan) for analyzing and interpreting results from the assessment-** In addition to the yearly lesson plan calibration assessment (internal consistency) among Clemmer faculty, the lesson plan rubric assessment data is reviewed yearly at department data evaluation

meetings. In these data meetings, departments will be provided with the most recent yearly lesson plan assessment data, in addition to their previous year's action plan based on last preceding year's data (e.g., fall 2020 data meeting will review 2019-2020 lesson plan data, as well as the action plan based on the 2018-2019 data). Action plan will be reviewed by departments and the CAEP committee on a yearly basis as part of the quality assurance plan.

Data meetings will analyze assessment data from each independent rubric item individually, highlighting strengths and weaknesses for future program improvement. Data and action plans will be shared yearly at EPP partnership meetings.

- e. **The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing validity of data from an assessment-** All rubrics were developed with input from ETSU teacher education faculty in addition to feedback from LEA partners, and materials (both lesson plans and associated rubric) are reviewed yearly in the beginning of the year. Finally, content validity was established through (a) numerous content validity meetings and procedures, as well as (b) through Lawshe's content validity ration. These procedures have been widely regarded as acceptable evidence to support reality in rubric development (Moskal & Leydens, 2000). Thus, the described validity methodology used with the lesson plan assessment rubric is deemed acceptable and appropriate by current research standards.