

Virginia Quality Criteria Review Tool for Performance Assessments

Revised: June 2019

This document details a set of criteria for the development of performance assessments that measure the application of content knowledge and skills. The criteria are designed to support comparability in rigor and quality across the state.

Briefly, the seven criteria include:

- 1: Standards/Intended Learning Outcomes
- 2: Authenticity
- 3: Language Use for Expressing Reasoning
- 4: Success Criteria for Students
- 5: Student Directions, Prompt, and Resources/Materials
- 6: Accessibility
- 7: Feasibility

It is not expected that every quality performance assessment will have full evidence that corresponds to each description within the Virginia Quality Criteria Review Tool. For example, it is not expected that a task include each of the deeper learning competencies listed in criterion 1C (i.e., mastering rigorous academic content; learning how to think critically and solve problems; working collaboratively; communicating effectively; directing one's own learning; and developing an academic mindset), but a quality task should provide the opportunity for students to demonstrate one or more of these competencies. Additionally, the criteria may be considered in any order that suits the division's needs and purpose. School divisions are encouraged to use this tool not only as they develop new performance assessments, but also as they evaluate the quality of existing tasks. If a task does not fully meet the expectations detailed for that criterion, the school division should use the evidence or rationale to modify and improve the task before using that task with students.

Virginia Quality Criteria Review Tool for Performance Assessments

Revised: June 2019

Criterion 1: Standards/Intended Learning Outcomes

The rubric for the quality rating is as follows: 0-No Evidence; 1-Limited Evidence; 2-Partial Evidence; 3-Full Evidence.

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
1A	Virginia Standards of Learning selected for the performance assessment are clearly listed in a task template, developmentally appropriate for target students, and aligned to the grade-level scope and sequence or grade-level curriculum. Performance assessment components, resources/materials, and student products are aligned to the listed SOLs.		
1B	The performance assessment goes beyond simple recall, elicits evidence of complex student thinking, and requires application of disciplinary or cross-disciplinary concepts, practices, and/or transferable skills, such as application, analysis, evaluation, synthesis, or original creation.		
1C	<p>The performance assessment provides an opportunity for students to develop and demonstrate (even if not explicitly assessed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deeper learning competencies, defined as mastering rigorous academic content; learning how to think critically and solve problems; working collaboratively; communicating effectively; directing one’s own learning; and developing an academic mindset. <p>The performance assessment may also provide opportunities for students to develop and demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life-Ready competencies defined by the Profile of a Virginia Graduate as content knowledge, career planning, workplace skills, and community and 		

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
	civic responsibility; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology-related competencies; • Integration of intended learning outcomes from two or more subjects. 		

Criterion 2: Authenticity

The rubric for the quality rating is as follows: 0-No Evidence; 1-Limited Evidence; 2-Partial Evidence; 3-Full Evidence.

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
2	The performance assessment is authentic along the dimensions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The performance assessment’s topic, context (scenario), materials/resources, products, and purpose/audience (i.e., what students are asked to do and for whom) are relevant to the real-world, students’ community, students’ interests, future careers, or other meaningful context. • The performance assessment asks students to do work authentic to the discipline (i.e., what adult practitioners of the discipline do), such as science inquiry; math problem-solving; analyzing and critiquing a text; analyzing and evaluating historical sources. 		

Criterion 3: Language Use for Expressing Reasoning

The rubric for the quality rating is as follows: 0-No Evidence; 1-Limited Evidence; 2-Partial Evidence; 3-Full Evidence.

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
3A	The performance assessment supports language use and development by providing multiple means of accessing and using developmentally appropriate academic and disciplinary language for the students to express their		

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
	reasoning.		
3B	The performance assessment should require students to use one or more forms of language to communicate their reasoning. The performance assessment may provide access to functional, academic, and disciplinary language in various forms of language media (text, video, audio, oral) OR provide opportunity to practice the use of language through multiple means of expression and language production (text, language media production, oral language, or conversation with peers).		

Criterion 4: Success Criteria for Students

The Virginia Department of Education’s Common Rubrics, when available, should be used to evaluate and score student work. The rubric for the quality rating is as follows: 0-No Evidence; 1-Limited Evidence; 2-Partial Evidence; 3-Full Evidence.

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
4A	The performance assessment includes a rubric or other appropriate scoring tools (e.g., checklist, analytic rubric) with scoring dimensions that are tightly aligned to performance expectations of the intended learning outcomes targeted within the performance assessment. Criteria should include language objectives, if applicable.		
4B	The scoring tool is written clearly and concisely, with audience-friendly language, as appropriate. Language of the scoring tool should describe how a response demonstrates performance expectations so that the tool may be used to provide feedback to students about their work and how it can be improved.		
4C	The scoring tool or feedback methodology should be used across performance assessments within the course so that results on the performance assessment can be used to communicate a consistent set of expectations to students, monitor students’ academic growth over time, inform		

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
	instructional decisions, and communicate student proficiency to others (e.g., parents/guardians).		

Criterion 5: Student Directions, Prompt, and Resources/Materials

The rubric for the quality rating is as follows: 0-No Evidence; 1-Limited Evidence; 2-Partial Evidence; 3-Full Evidence.

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
5A	The student-facing task prompt, directions, and resources/materials are aligned to the intended learning outcomes, task purpose, and the performance expectations being assessed (i.e., the student product will provide evidence of the performance expectations).		
5B	The student-facing task prompt, directions, and resources/materials are clear, complete, written in accessible language appropriate to the grade level, and organized for students in an accessible format.		
5C	The task prompt/directions, topic, context (scenario), and materials/resources are sensitive to the community and free of bias.		

Criterion 6: Accessibility

The rubric for the quality rating is as follows: 0-No Evidence; 1-Limited Evidence; 2-Partial Evidence; 3-Full Evidence.

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
6A	The performance assessment is designed to accommodate the participation of all students. Directions for teachers for the performance assessment identify appropriate supports or alternatives to facilitate accessibility while maintaining the validity and reliability of the assessment.		
6B	The performance assessment is accessible and allows for differentiating the ways that students demonstrate their knowledge such as through the application of principles of		

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
	Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Refer to the National Center on UDL at the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST).		

Criterion 7: Feasibility

The rubric for the quality rating is as follows: 0-No Evidence; 1-Limited Evidence; 2-Partial Evidence; 3-Full Evidence.

#	Description	Quality Rating	Evidence or Rationale
7A	Student-facing prompts, directions, resources/materials, and scoring tools are included. Resources and materials required by the performance assessment are realistic and easily accessible to teachers.		
7B	Duration of implementation of the performance assessment is indicated and is realistic for the complexity of the assessment and the scope of performance expectations being assessed.		
7C	If the performance assessment is implemented over multiple lessons, a schedule indicating how the performance assessment is implemented across the lessons is included. Information about students' prior learning and how the performance assessment fits within a learning sequence is included.		