

Design Criteria Chart

Defining Performance Indicators for Content-Area Graduation Standards¹

Criteria	Weaker Statements	Stronger Statements
<p>Graduation-Standard Alignment <i>To what extent does the statement align with the relevant graduation standard? Is the statement central to understanding the standard as described?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are either too abstract (and therefore cannot be measured) or too specific (and therefore fail to address broadly applicable content-area skills and knowledge) • Are so detailed that they obscure their connection to the graduation standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe and define what students need to know and be able to do to demonstrate proficiency in and achievement of the content-area graduation standard • Use precise, descriptive language that clearly communicates what is essential to achieving the graduation standard
<p>Enduring Knowledge <i>To what extent does this statement provide students with knowledge and skills that will be of value beyond a particular point in time, such as when students take a test or complete the unit?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are limited to the scope and sequence of a specific textbook, resource, or program • Describe only knowledge and skills that are relevant or unique to a specific unit • Are “nice to know” but not essential for students to learn if they are going to succeed in next unit, course, or grade level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require students to develop and demonstrate skills and knowledge that will endure throughout their education, professional careers, and civic lives. • Answers the question: “What do we want students to remember, understand, and be able to do several years from now, perhaps long after they have forgotten the details?”
<p>Cognitive Demand <i>What level of conceptual comprehension, knowledge acquisition, and skill development does the statement encourage? What depth of knowledge does this statement promote? Is the level of cognitive demand expected measurable?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require only basic recall and lower-level cognitive skills, such as identifying, defining, summarizing, or listing • Do not encourage the application of knowledge to diverse or novel problems and situations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require students to demonstrate higher-order cognitive skills, such as those described in the Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy, Marzano’s New Taxonomy, or Webb’s Depth of Knowledge • Promote deeper comprehension of content and the acquisition of transferable skills such as reasoning, planning, interpreting, hypothesizing, investigating, or explaining • Are measurable
<p>Assessment Facilitation <i>To what extent does the statement allow for a broad range of formative and summative assessments?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest only limited options for assessing and demonstrating learning • Fail to describe in precise and understandable language what will be measured • Focus narrowly on factual recall and rote skills • Suggest that a single task or activity can be considered a valid demonstration of proficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help define the specific knowledge and skills that will be assessed and measured • Promote the assessment of deeper content comprehension and the acquisition of transferable skills • Promote multiple and varied options for students to demonstrate evidence of learning, particularly through performance assessments and body-of-evidence strategies such as portfolios

¹Based on the work of Larry Ainsworth, Doug Reeves, and New Hampshire Department of Education’s Course Level Competency Validation Rubric.

