

## Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) Rubrics reviewed for Validity using the Lawshe Method

Sixteen subject matter experts (unit faculty members) reviewed the TLC unit rubrics and rated each descriptor as “Essential”, “Useful, but not Essential”, or “Not Necessary”. The Dean, Department Chair of Elementary Education, and Assessment Coordinator along with **methods instructors** in English Language Learners, Special Education, and Kindergarten; secondary Business and Math Education; K-12 Art, Music, and Physical Education; as well as elementary methods instructors for Science, Reading, Language Arts, and Social Studies were among the subject matter experts who completed the survey.

The Lawshe method gauges agreement among raters regarding how essential a particular item is and establishes content validity (quantifying consensus). Lawshe (1975) proposed that each of the subject matter expert raters (SMEs) on the panel respond to the following question for each item: "Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item 'essential,' 'useful, but not essential,' or 'not necessary' to the performance of the construct?" If more than half the panelists indicate an item is essential, that item has at least some content validity. Greater levels of content validity exist as larger numbers of panelists agree that a particular item is essential. Using these assumptions, Lawshe developed a formula termed the content validity ratio.

$$CVR = [(E - (N / 2)) / (N / 2)]$$

CVR can measure between -1.0 and 1.0. The closer to 1.0 the CVR is, the more essential the object is considered to be. Conversely, the closer to -1.0 the CVR is, the more non-essential it is.

### Procedure

VCSU spoke to a group of experts who have knowledge of TLC components and expectations. **Subject Matter Experts were asked to rate each descriptor as “essential”, “useful, but not essential”, or “not necessary”** for assessing the TLC unit. **Sixteen of 25 experts completed the task.** The response ratings were tallied a Content Validity Ratio (CVR) is using the following formula, using the total number of experts (N) and the number who rated the descriptor as essential (E):  $CVR = [(E - (N / 2)) / (N / 2)]$

*The following information is from a CAEP recommendation from a PowerPoint prepared by Dr. Stevie Chepko, Senior VP for Accreditation (Retrieved on October 17, 2017 from <https://www.education.ne.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/NE-ContentValidityReliability.pdf>)*

- CVR is calculated for each indicator
- A minimum value of the CVR is based on the number of panelists and is on a CVR Table
  - CVR values range from -1.0 to + 1.0
  - The more panelists the lower the CVR value
  - For example –
    - 5 panelists requires a minimum CVR value of .99
    - **15 panelists requires a minimum CVR value of .49 (VCSU had 16 panelists complete the survey)**
    - 40 panelists requires a minimum CVR value of .29
    - Allows for the retention or rejection of individual items

The ten assessment headings are identified by Roman numerals. The numbered items represent TLC unit rubric descriptors for the assessments. The experts' ratings are tallied and a content validity ratio is calculated for each descriptor.

I. Planning for Understanding of Content - How well does the teacher candidate plan to ensure the content standards and learning objectives will be met?	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Content Validity Ratio
1. Standards, objectives, learning tasks and materials/ technology are consistently aligned with each other and with the central focus for the learning segment.	16	0	0	<b>1.00</b>
2. Learning objectives clearly define measurable outcomes for student learning.	16	0	0	<b>1.00</b>
3. Plans for instruction build on each other to lead students to make clear and meaningful connections to the unit's big ideas, as well as higher levels of thinking.	16	0	0	<b>1.00</b>

<b>II. Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning - How well does the teacher candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students' development and understanding?</b>	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Content Validity Ratio
4. Planned support includes tasks/materials and/or scaffolding tied to learning objectives and the central focus with attention to the characteristics of the class as a whole and to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.	9	7	0	0.13
5. Learning objectives draw on students' prior learning experience AND social/emotional development OR interests.	6	9	1	-0.25
6. Candidate uses examples from their students' prior learning experience AND relevant research/theories to justify why learning tasks are appropriate.	7	6	3	-0.13
7. Supports address the needs of specific individuals or groups with similar needs and include strategies to surface and respond to common errors and misunderstandings.	5	9	2	-0.38
8. Planned support includes multiple ways of engaging with content that support students to meet specific standards/objectives within the central focus.	11	3	2	0.38
9. Support is specifically designed to address a variety of student learning strengths and needs, and include specific strategies to surface and respond to common errors and misunderstandings.	10	6	0	0.25
<b>III. Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning - How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to provide evidence of student progress toward the standards/objectives?</b>	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Content Validity Ratio
10. The set of assessments are aligned to the standards and objectives, and provide evidence for monitoring students' learning progress at different points in the unit.	15	1	0	<b>0.88</b>
11. Assessment accommodation modifications are made for students with special needs, IEP or 504 plans.	14	2	0	<b>0.75</b>
12. The set of assessments are strategically designed to provide multiple forms of evidence for monitoring students' progress relative to the standards and objectives throughout the unit.	11	5	0	0.38
<b>IV. Planning for Language Development - How does the candidate plan to support the students' academic language associated with content learning?</b>	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Content Validity Ratio
13. The candidate identifies vocabulary (and/or symbols) that are central to the learning segment and appropriate to most students' language development.	10	6	0	0.25
14. The candidate's description of students' academic language development identifies strengths and needs.	4	11	1	-0.50
15. The candidate provides support so students can use language associated with the selected language demand necessary to engage in academic tasks.	9	5	2	0.13
16. The candidate models and provides opportunities for practice so students can use language (associated with the language demand) to express and demonstrate content understandings.	11	5	0	0.38
<b>V. Standards Based Engagement in Scaffolding Language during Implementation - How does the candidate support language development and content learning? (video)</b>	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Content Validity Ratio
17. Candidate identifies evidence that students had an opportunity to understand and use the identified academic language.	11	5	0	0.38
18. Candidate identifies evidence that students understand and are using targeted academic language in ways that support their language development and content learning.	9	6	1	0.13

<b>VI. Standards Based Student Engagement and Classroom Management - How does the candidate manage the classroom and actively engage students in developing understanding? (video)</b>	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Content Validity Ratio
19. Students are intellectually engaged in discussions, tasks, or activities <b>tailored to specific student needs that support the development of deep understandings</b> of concepts.	13	3	0	<b>0.63</b>
20. Both teacher-student and student-student interaction are evident.	13	2	1	<b>0.63</b>
21. Candidate was able to reach out to an individual or small groups to vary his or her teaching in order to create the best learning experience possible, making links between new content and students' prior learning as well as <b>deepening</b> understandings of the concepts.	10	6	0	0.25
22. Candidate leads a caring, fair and respectful learning environment in which directions and routines are clear so students are engaged with minimal time transition time between tasks.	14	2	0	<b>0.75</b>
23. Any potential behavior problems are recognized and redirected in ways that set firm limits but do not belittle the student or punish others for a single student's behavior.	13	3	0	<b>0.63</b>
24. Candidate differentiates instruction and makes links between new content and students' prior learning.	12	4	0	<b>0.50</b>
25. Classroom is managed in an efficient and effective manner to heighten learning opportunities.	16	0	0	<b>1.00</b>
<b>VII. Standards Based Student Engagement in Higher Level Thinking - How does the candidate elicit and monitor students' responses to deepen their understanding? (video)</b>	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Content Validity Ratio
26. Candidate uses highest levels of Bloom's Taxonomy to facilitate interactions among students to evaluate their own ideas.	10	5	1	0.25
27. Candidate uses analysis and synthesis questions to elicit answers that build on students' reasoning/problem solving to portray, extend, or clarify a concept. (*N =15 as one panelist did not rate this descriptor)	7	7	1	-0.07
28. Candidate uses strategically chosen representations in ways that deepen student understanding of the concepts being learned.	8	8	0	0.00
29. The candidate elicits student responses related to reasoning/problem solving.	8	8	0	0.00
30. Candidate uses representations in ways that help students understand concepts being learned.	8	8	0	0.00
<b>VIII. Assessment and Analysis of Student Work - How does the candidate demonstrate an understanding of student performance with respect to standards/objectives?</b>	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Content Validity Ratio
31. The candidate is able to identify areas of strength in a predominantly weak performance and/or areas for improvement in a predominantly strong one.	12	3	1	<b>0.50</b>
32. Criteria are clearly aligned with standards/objectives from the learning segment.	15	1	0	<b>0.88</b>
33. Criteria indicate qualitative differences in student performance.	7	8	1	-0.13
34. The analysis focuses on patterns of student understandings, skills, and misunderstandings in relation to identified standards and learning objectives.	8	8	0	0.00
35. The analysis uses these patterns to understand student thinking.	5	9	2	-0.38
36. The analysis is supported by work samples and the summary of performance, as well as references to evidence in work samples to identify specific patterns of learning for individuals or groups.	12	4	0	<b>0.50</b>
37. The analysis is supported by work samples and the summary of performance, with attention to some differences in whole class learning of different aspects of the content assessed.	8	7	1	0.00
38. The analysis focuses on listing what students did right and wrong in relation to the use of procedures and reasoning/problem solving skills for identified standards/objectives.	7	8	1	-0.13

<b>IX. Using Assessment and Feedback to Inform Instruction and Guide Student Learning</b> - <i>How does the candidate use conclusions about what students know and are able to do to provide feedback and plan next steps in instruction to further learning.</i>	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Content Validity Ratio
39. Feedback accurately identifies general areas for what students did well and what they need to improve related to specific learning objectives.	14	2	0	<b>0.75</b>
40. Candidate describes how students will use feedback to improve their performance.	8	8	0	0.00
41. Next steps propose general support that improves student performance related to the standards and learning objectives assessed.	9	6	1	0.13
42. Next steps provide targeted support to individuals and groups to improve their performance relative to the standards and learning objectives assessed.	12	4	0	<b>0.50</b>
43. Feedback is related to learning objectives.	11	5	0	0.38
44. Candidate describes how students will use feedback to deepen their understandings and to evaluate their own work.	7	9	0	-0.13
45. Next steps provide targeted support to individuals and groups to improve their performance relative to the standards and learning objectives assessed. (*N =15 as one panelist did not rate this descriptor)	11	4	0	0.47
46. Next steps extend student learning beyond what was assessed in the learning segment.	6	9	1	-0.25
<b>X. Analyzing Teacher Effectiveness</b> - <i>How does the candidate use evidence and change teaching practice to meet the varied learning needs of the students?</i>	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Content Validity Ratio
47. Candidate cites evidence of student learning OR knowledge of students' prior learning and experiences to explain changes to teaching practices.	11	4	1	0.38
48. Proposed changes address students' collective learning needs related to standards/objectives.	8	7	1	0.00
49. Changes in teaching practice are specific and strategic to improve individual and collective student understanding of standards/objectives.	12	3	1	<b>0.50</b>
50. Candidate justifies changes to teaching practices by citing: • examples of successful and unsuccessful teaching practices • analysis of learning evidence • knowledge of students' prior learning and experiences	13	3	0	<b>0.63</b>

**Ideas for wording or content changes to the descriptors were welcomed and examples of starter samples provided:**

I suggest we change "learning objectives" to "learning targets" throughout the descriptors?

I would like us to add \_\_\_\_\_ as a descriptor to section VII.

*A proposal from the TLC work session is to reduce the four videos (90 seconds each) to three videos, changing the template and re-aligning the rubrics slightly: (Rubric 5) scaffolding academic language, (Rubric 6) classroom management, and (Rubric 7) engagement in standards based instruction and student interaction (content, higher level thinking and questioning) – this video could be 90 seconds to 180 seconds.*

**Actual feedback responses received:**

- No ideas at this point.
- Some of the wording is not clear...I would rather very easy-to-understand and concise statements.
- Change "learning objectives" to "learning targets" throughout the descriptors. I support the proposal from the TLC work session to reduce the four videos (90 seconds each) to three videos, changing the template and re-aligning the rubrics slightly: (Rubric 5) scaffolding academic language, (Rubric 6) classroom management, and (Rubric 7) engagement in standards based instruction and student interaction (content, higher level thinking and questioning) – this video could be 90 seconds to 180 seconds.

The TLC unit and assessment data are tagged to CAEP standards 1.1, 1.2, and 5.4, as well as InTASC standards and VCSU teacher education program learning outcomes.

VCSU Program Learning Outcome	InTASC Standard	Section(s) in TLC Rubric
<b>PLAN</b>	<b>7 – Planning for Instruction</b>	<b>I - IV</b>
<b>IMPLEMENT</b>	<b>8 – Instructional Strategies</b>	<b>V- VII</b>
<b>EVALUATE</b>	<b>6 - Assessment</b>	<b>VIII, IX</b>
<b>REFLECT</b>	<b>9 – Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</b>	<b>X</b>