SASB Rubric suggested for use by ACTFL/CAEP Reviewers

| Rating | Not Met | Met with Conditions | Met |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| **Assessments align with standard and description of assignment, scoring guide and data chart align with each other.** | Assessments fail to align with standard's elements and provide no evidence for the meeting of the standard. **OR** Description of the assignment, scoring guide, or data chart do not align with each other or the standard **OR** A required component (narrative, description of the assessments scoring guide, or data chart) is missing | Assessments appear to be generic and align to some extent with standard elements. Key components specific to the content area are not addressed in any of the assessments for this standard. **OR** Assessments have multiple items that may indirectly align with the standard/elements. **OR** One of three essential components is not aligned with other or is incomplete. All must be aligned with the standard/element to achieve met with conditions. | Assessments align with the standard's elements and provide direct evidence for meeting element(s) of the standard. In addition, descriptions of the assignment, scoring guides and data charts align with each other and provide evidence of candidate knowledge and attainment of the standard. |
| **Assessments assess meaningful content specific knowledge and skills for the standard.** | Assessments fail to measure key components of the standard. **OR** Assessments consist of simply a checklist of items to be included in the assessment and do not address the quality of candidate performance. | Numerous items are presented on the assessments, however the items are limited in scope or only partially provide evidence for meeting of the elements of the standard. **OR** The assessments fail to define candidate behavior at each level in operational terms. For example: Levels of candidate proficiency are differentiated only in terms of frequency by using such terms as "consistently", "occasionally" or "never." **OR** One item is purported to align with multiple standards and not one individual standard. While an assessment may provide evidence for multiple standards, individual items on the assessment usually cannot provide adequate evidence for multiple standards. | Assessments identify key components of required content specific knowledge and skills and provide evidence of candidate knowledge and/or attainment of the standard. |
| **Data demonstrate that candidates have met the standard/element.** | Data charts do not align with the assessment. Data charts fail to identify percentage of candidates | Program fails to report the overall number of candidates. Data charts do not align directly with the scoring guide. The data charts | Data charts are aligned with the assessment; percentage and/or mean and range of candidates achieving the acceptable level is |

| Rating | Not Met | Met with Conditions | Met |
|---|---|---|---|
| | at the acceptable level and simply report a mean score. **OR** A generic scoring guide is used that simply assigns a value across all items. **OR** Data are missing from the chart. Data are reported by individual student and not aggregated Insufficient data are provided; therefore, the reviewer cannot determine if the standards are met. Insufficient data are presented or data are not disaggregated to the program level. | report mean scores for categories while the scoring guide is organized by item or percentage of candidates achieving a specific level and are reported for the category and not individual item. **OR** Data are aligned to multiple standards and an aggregate score is reported for an overall category. Data must be reported at the same level as it was collected in the assessment. If data are collected on individual items, it must be reported by individual items and not an average or overall score for the assessment or for a category. | reported; charts are correctly labeled; and all required data are reported. |
| **Scoring guides (rubrics) assess distinct levels of candidate proficiency.** | Scoring guide (rubric) consist of a checklist of behaviors that can be answered yes or no. Behaviors are not defined or expectations identified. Performance levels are unclear and/or subjective, potentially allowing for biased results. **OR** Scoring guides (rubrics) are inconsistent or incomplete. **OR** Distinctions between performance levels are not clear. | The assessments fail to define candidate behavior at each level in operational terms. For example: Throughout the scoring guide (rubric), levels of candidate proficiency are differentiated only in terms of frequency by using such terms as "consistently", "occasionally" or "never." | Scoring guides (rubrics) identify distinct levels of candidate proficiency in terms of criteria, are content specific, observable, and measurable behaviors, allowing for fair and unbiased results. Moreover, they use a scale with descriptors of each item to be rated. Quality and quantity indicators are employed as appropriate. |
| **Preponderance of evidence.** | While some evidence is provided, it is insufficient for reviewers to determine the standard is met. **OR** Assessments fail to assess the depth and breadth of the standard. | Multiple assessments are provided for meeting standards, but provide only partial or marginal evidence. The assessments submitted only partial align with the standard. | Sufficient evidence is presented in the required format for reviewers to determine that the depth and breadth of the standard has been assessed. |

| Rating | Not Met | Met with Conditions | Met |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **OR**<br>Required elements are missing from assessments.<br>**OR**<br>Assessments fail to assess the majority of key components of the standards.<br>Data presented as evidence are comingled; thereby, making it difficult for the reviewer to determine if the standard is met. | | |