**Outcomes**

Our goal for this morning is to use some sample student work to tune and revise the scoring criteria. Our larger goal is to produce scoring criteria that are clear enough to support the drafting of sample tasks. Once these tasks have been piloted and we have student work from them, we will be able to engage in further tuning and clarification of the scoring criteria.

**Guiding Questions**

Do these scoring criteria help focus attention on specific features of the student work that relate to the Performance Indicators?

**Time**

85 minutes

**Participants**

4-8 group members

**Roles**

Facilitator, Timekeeper, Notetaker

Assessment Design Notetaker: This person will pay attention during the discussion to all ideas about how to design assessments for these performance indicators, and will capture these ideas in a separate set of notes.

**Process**

Each group will focus on two Performance Indicators

1. **10 minutes:** Examination of student work. The group silently reviews the samples of student work. If possible, each group member should give the student work a grade for the two performance indicators on which they will focus. If it seems impossible to assess the work using the scoring criteria, consider whether that is because features are missing from the work, or because the criteria need to be clearer.
2. **15 minutes:** Focusing on one of the Performance Indicators, use a round robin format to discuss these questions: The purpose of the performance indicators and scoring criteria are to break down the transferable skill into its components. Does this set of scoring criteria successfully focus attention on the specific features of the student work that relate to the performance indicator? Does it successfully describe what is there, or what should be there?
3. **10 minutes:** After discussing these questions, the group should work together to generate a list of any features that are not described by the scoring criteria.
4. **10 minutes:** Reflection. The group discusses and identifies what they will revise in the scoring criteria as a result of this discussion.
5. **35 minutes:** Repeat steps 2 – 4 for the second Performance Indicator.
6. **5 minutes:** Debrief the protocol. The facilitator helps the group assess how helpful the protocol was (or was not) in meeting the purpose of the protocol and the needs of the group.

* What worked well in this process?
* What could we improve to yield a more effective discussion and revision?