Note: This micro-credential requires that the earner collaborate with a minimum of three other educators to review their performance assessments, one created by the learner and another created by one of the collaborators.

Performance Assessment Validation
Educator analyzes a performance assessment and rubric for qualities of validity.

Key Method
The educator analyzes a performance assessment and rubric for qualities of validity (alignment, fairness, clarity, engagement, and scoring criteria). This micro-credential will focus on 1) giving feedback based on task quality criteria and 2) receiving feedback and making revisions.

Method Components
The Basic Performance Assessment for Learning Design stack is designed so that, if all three credentials are taken together, they will become more than the sum of their parts. Each micro-credential is intended to be able to stand on its own; however, the ideas and activities of each of these credentials support and expand on the others, allowing a fuller appreciation of performance assessment and its implications.

Your Task:
Conduct a Validation Protocol meeting with at least two other educators.

1. Provide feedback on another educator’s task.
   a. Conduct the Assessment Validation Protocol with the presenting educator and at least two other educators and complete the Assessment Validation Checklist, making thorough notes.
   b. Provide actionable feedback to the presenter(s), indicating where the task is strong (in terms of validity) and where changes might be made to strengthen it.

2. Receive feedback on your own task.
   a. Conduct the Assessment Validation Protocol with at least three educators and have them complete the Assessment Validation Checklist about your assessment, making thorough notes.
   b. Receive actionable feedback from your colleague.
   c. Make revisions based on that feedback.

When we ask whether a task is valid, we are asking whether it actually measures the learning target we intend it to measure, as well as giving all students the opportunity to demonstrate achievement.

We ask the following: Is the PA tightly aligned to the learning target? Is the PA fair? Do all students have equal opportunity to demonstrate achievement of the learning target(s)? Is the PA engaging? Does it allow multiple modalities for learning and demonstrating achievement? Does it allow student voice and choice? These and other questions that raise issues around validity can be found in the Assessment Validation Checklist (see Resources).
Assuring the validity of PAs is a complicated and subtle process—far more complicated than looking at a list of traits and checking them off. As much as this micro-credential is about validity, it is about the process of assuring validity, which is necessarily a collaborative one.

The required protocol to use is the Assessment Validation Checklist and the Assessment Validation Protocol (see Resources).

**Supporting Research**


**Resources**


**Tools**

- Assessment Validation Checklist: Tool 1 [http://tinyurl.com/hukejvw](http://tinyurl.com/hukejvw)
- Assessment Validation Coversheet: Tool 2 [http://tinyurl.com/j4eaagq](http://tinyurl.com/j4eaagq)
- Assessment Validation Protocol: Tool 3 [http://tinyurl.com/hybuyat](http://tinyurl.com/hybuyat)
- Video Module: The Validation Process [http://tinyurl.com/hpz9txy](http://tinyurl.com/hpz9txy)
- Video Module: The Validation Protocol [http://tinyurl.com/hhhy2v](http://tinyurl.com/hhhy2v)

**Submission Guidelines & Evaluation Criteria**

*To earn the micro-credential, you must receive a passing evaluation for Parts 1 and 3 and a “Got it” for Part 2.*

**Part 1. Overview questions**

(200-word limit for each response)
- Describe the context within which this feedback is being given. What school? Grade level? Subject area? What is the history of your PLC and your history of giving and receiving feedback with that colleague?
- Describe the experience of giving feedback to your peer(s) on validity. What did you notice? What was challenging?
- Describe the experience of receiving feedback from your peer(s). What did you notice? What was challenging? How did you go about executing revisions?
- **Passing**: For both questions, earners should provide context for the artifacts they are submitting and insight into the experience of giving and receiving substantive feedback on professional work.

**Part 2. Evidence/artifacts**
To earn the micro-credential for Performance Assessment Validation, the educator must submit the following:

**For Giving Feedback:**
- A copy of your partner’s performance assessment (student instructions and rubric).
- A copy of the completed Assessment Validation Checklist, with thorough notes.
- A copy of any other feedback you provided your partner, either written or recorded.

**For Receiving Feedback:**
- A copy of your performance assessment, with tracked edits showing the revisions made throughout the process.
- A copy of the Assessment Validation Checklist, completed and with your reviewing team’s thorough notes.

**Demonstrating the Process:**
- A video, audio, or transcript of you and your partner thoughtfully discussing the validation process. It could be either an open conversation or an interview of your colleague conducted by you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Got It&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Not Yet&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed <a href="http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/">Assessment Validation Checklist</a> identifies the qualities of validity and includes actionable feedback related to the quality criteria.</td>
<td>Feedback is general and nonspecific, only loosely connected to the Assessment Validation Checklist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edited PA with “Tracked Changes” and comments indicating edits. Performance assessment is thoroughly analyzed according to the quality criteria, and edits reflect the validation process and conversation with partner.</td>
<td>Feedback is not actionable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either there are only cursory analysis and edits to the performance assessment OR they don’t reflect the Assessment Validation Checklist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 3. Reflection**
Write a reflective essay (1,000-word limit) OR record a five- to ten-minute video or audio addressing the following topics (be sure to use specifics that illustrate why you come to the conclusions you do):

- In general, what did you notice about leading the validation process? What were some challenges for you?
- Describe how your understanding of task design was improved by engaging in this validation process?
What is the importance to you of working with a team in this process? How was your team valuable to you, and vice versa? What were your team’s thoughts on the process?

- **Passing**: Answer shows thoughtful consideration of the experience, making reference to specifics. In other words, the answer does not speak simply in generalities but is clearly based on the learner’s experience with the validation process.