



Eliciting Accurate Evidence of Student Learning

Educator designs sound assessments that generate accurate evidence of student learning. The educator's rubrics meet quality criteria that provide accurate feedback regarding student learning.

Key Method

Sound assessment design is the ability to understand the different purposes and types of assessment to select the most appropriate type of assessment. For sound assessment design, teachers audit, refine, and reflect upon a formative assessment for purpose. The educator refines and reflects upon a rubric to provide accurate feedback regarding student learning.

Method Components

The Importance of High-Quality Assessments

When educators do not create or use sound design assessments, student learning evidence is inaccurate. When educators lack evidence of student learning, they can't make appropriate instructional decisions to help students progress.

Educators can create classroom assessments that elicit evidence of learning by knowing assessment methods, choosing adequate question sample size, and minimizing bias.

Components of Sound Assessment Design

Educators with sound assessment design knowledge can:

- Identify assessment **purpose**
 - (see "[Five Keys to High-Quality Classroom Assessment](#)" in Resources)

- Identify assessment **methods**: selected response, written response, personal communication, portfolio, and performance task.
 - *(see the Resources labeled Target-Method Match for more information)*
- Identify **learning target types**: knowledge, reasoning, skill, product
 - *(see Resources labeled Target-Method Match for more information))*
- Identify **potential sources of assessment bias** that can occur within the student: language, health/physical handicap, emotional considerations, the assessment context: insufficient time, noise distraction, lighting, lack of rapport from the assessment itself: lacking or vague directions, poorly worded questions
 - *(see “Designing and Evaluating Quality Assessments” and video of James Popham explaining forms of assessment bias in Resources)*
- Identify **adequate sample size**: how much evidence of student learning is enough to make an accurate determination of proficiency

Educators with sound assessment design abilities can:

- Audit and refine an assessment for purpose, target-method match, sampling, bias, as distortion

For educators to provide accurate feedback regarding student learning, educators must also know how to create quality rubrics.

Components of Quality Student Rubric Criteria

Educators with knowledge of quality rubric criteria can identify rubric quality criteria. *(see “Creating and Recognizing Quality Rubrics” in Resources)*

- Alignment to the learning target(s)
- Focus on assessed elements
- Organized and independent criteria
- Accurate descriptors of learning levels

Educators with quality student rubric criteria abilities can:

- Analyze and refine a rubric that provides accurate feedback regarding evidence of student learning

Supporting Rationale and Research

Chappuis, Jan. "Helping Students Understand Assessment." Educational Leadership, vol. 63, no. 3, Nov. 2005, pp. 39–43.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237356540_Helping_Students_Understand_Assessment

Farrell, C.* & Marsh, J. (2016). Metrics matter: How properties of data shape teachers' instructional responses. Educational Administration Quarterly, 52(3), 423-462.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1104598>

Shepard, L. A. (2008). The Role of Assessment in a Learning Culture. Journal Of Education, 189(1/2), 95-106.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/10ClqOXTVrq3nFpKZriIsgZTZZPMc1TRt/view?usp=sharing>

Supovitz, J. (2012). Getting at student understanding—the key to teachers' use of test data. Teachers College Record, 114(11)

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1TI4chW0-LRxMqe_D5Noo-HM0pEcOi2dK/view

Resources

What is a High-Quality Assessment?

[What does a high-quality assessment actually look like?](#)

[Develop Our Assessment Literacy](#)

[Principles for Effective Classroom Assessment](#)

[7 Principles of Student-Centered Classroom Assessment](#)

Classroom Assessment Purpose

[Five Keys to High-Quality Classroom Assessment](#)

Target-Method Match

[ACTION TOOL A: - Understanding Learning Targets](#)

[Assessments that Align with Learning Objectives](#)

[Criteria for Procuring and Evaluating High-Quality Assessments](#)

[Matching the Assessment Methods to the Learning Target](#)

Assessment Literacy

Revised on: Jul 3, 2025

[Teaching Excellence & Educational Innovation](#)

[Target-Method Match](#)

Bias and Distortion

[Criteria for high-quality assessment](#)

[Forms of assessment bias](#)

Rubrics

[Google Classroom Rubrics](#)

[Using rubrics | Center for Teaching Innovation](#)

Submission Guidelines & Evaluation Criteria

To earn the micro-credential, you must receive a passing score in Parts 1 and 3 and a proficient score for all components in Part 2.

Part 1. Overview Questions (Provides Context)

(200 - 500 words per prompt)

Please answer the following contextual questions to provide an understanding of your current situation. Please do not include any information that will make you identifiable to your reviewers.

Prompt 1:

- Describe your students.
 - Include grade level, subject area, cultural backgrounds, and any special considerations regarding student characteristics (English Language Learners, Special Education, Gifted Learners, etc.).
- Consider a formative assessment that you currently use in your classroom to answer the following questions:
 - What is the role of this assessment in the scope of student learning?
 - Who will use the information and how?
 - How was the formative assessment created?

- How will you know if the assessment elicits accurate evidence of student learning?

Prompt 2:

- Did you use a student rubric to evaluate the formative assessment you considered in prompt 1? Why or why not?
- How do you currently provide accurate feedback to your students about their learning?
- How will you know if the student rubric is an effective tool to provide you with accurate evidence of student learning?

Passing: Educator completely answers each question and includes relevant examples from personal experience. Writing is organized and easy to understand.

Part 2. Work Examples/Artifacts/Evidence

To earn this micro-credential, utilize the suggested resources to complete and submit the following **five artifacts** as evidence of your learning. *Please do not include any information that will make you or your students identifiable to your reviewers.*

Submit artifacts that demonstrate your use of formative assessment through a documented cycle of design, analysis, and refinement. This process helps ensure that your assessment and rubric generate accurate evidence of student learning and support meaningful feedback.

The five artifacts are organized to reflect a clear learning cycle:

Step 1: **Design** a formative assessment aligned to sound assessment principles

Step 2: **Develop and evaluate** a student rubric to evaluate learning

Step 3: **Analyze** the assessment for alignment, bias, and effectiveness

Step 4: **Analyze** the rubric for clarity, alignment, and accuracy

Step 5: **Reflect, Revise and annotate** both tools based on your analysis and explain how the changes improve instructional decision-making

Each artifact builds on the last, providing a structured pathway to strengthen your assessment practice and deepen your understanding of how to elicit accurate evidence of student learning.

General Instructions:

- Clearly label each submission as Artifact 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5.
- Remove any information that could identify you or your students.

- Use annotations when requested. You may annotate using comment bubbles, text boxes, tables at the end of a document, or scanned handwritten notes.

Step 1: Design Your Formative Assessment

Artifact 1: Annotated Formative Assessment

Label your document: Artifact 1

Submit a formative assessment you have created. Annotate the assessment to identify and reflect on key components of sound assessment design (see "[Five Keys to High-Quality Sound Assessment](#)" in the Resources section):

- Assessment purpose
- Learning target(s) and target type(s)
- Assessment method(s)
- Sample size (how much evidence is gathered?)
- Potential sources of bias
- Planned accommodations or modifications
- If any components are missing or underdeveloped, include notes identifying them and explain what is needed.

Step 2: Develop and Annotate Your Student Rubric

Artifact 2: Annotated Rubric

Label your document: Artifact 2

Submit the rubric used to evaluate student performance on the formative assessment from Artifact 1. Annotate the rubric to show evidence of:

- Focus on the assessed elements
- Organized and independent criteria
- Clear and accurate descriptors of learning levels (e.g., basic, proficient, advanced)

If your formative assessment did not initially include a rubric, create one and follow the annotation guidance above.

Step 3: Analyze the Assessment Design

Artifact 3-Written Assessment Analysis

Label your document: Artifact 3

Using your annotated assessment from Artifact 1, write a 1–2 page (approximately 300–500 words) analysis. Submit this as a typed document or clearly formatted table. Address the following:

- How is the assessment aligned to its intended purpose and learning targets?
- Is the sample size sufficient to determine proficiency?
- What sources of bias or distortion are present, and how are they minimized?
- What specific changes are needed to improve the assessment's quality?

Refer to the resources provided in the micro-credential as needed.

Step 4: Analyze the Rubric

Artifact 4: Analyze the Student Rubric

Label your document: Artifact 4

Using your annotated rubric from Artifact 2, write a 1–2 page (approximately 300–500 words) analysis. Submit this as a typed document or clearly formatted table. Address the following:

- How well does the rubric align with the learning target(s)?
- Does it clearly focus on the specific elements being assessed?
- Are the criteria organized and independent, with specific learning level descriptors?
- What refinements are needed to improve clarity, accuracy, or usefulness?

Use insights from your own annotations and refer to the rubric resources provided.

Step 5: Reflect, Revise, and Annotate

Artifact 5: Revised Assessment and Rubric

Label your document(s): Artifact 5

Submit revised versions of both your formative assessment and rubric based on the analysis in Artifacts 3 and 4. In your submission:

- Highlight or annotate the changes made
- Provide a brief explanation of how the revisions improve the assessment's ability to elicit accurate evidence of student learning and support meaningful feedback

You may include this explanation directly in the document as comments or submit it as a short written summary (approximately 1 paragraph per revision).

Part 2. Rubric

	Proficient	Basic	Developing
Artifact 1: Annotated Formative Assessment	<p>Educator clearly identifies and annotates all components of sound assessment design, including purpose, target(s), target type(s), method(s), sample size, bias, and accommodations/modifications.</p> <p>Missing components, if any, are acknowledged with explanation.</p>	<p>Educator identifies and annotates some components of sound assessment design, but one or more components are missing without explanation.</p>	<p>Educator does not identify or annotate key components of sound assessment design.</p>
Artifact 2: Annotated Rubric	<p>Rubric aligns with the assessment in Artifact 1 and includes annotations identifying all three quality criteria components: focus on assessed elements, independent criteria, and accurate learning level descriptors. Missing components are noted and explained.</p>	<p>Rubric loosely aligns with the assessment OR annotations address only some quality criteria. Missing components are not clearly identified or explained.</p>	<p>Rubric does not align with the assessment and lacks annotations or identification of key criteria components.</p>
Artifact 3: Written Assessment Analysis	<p>Educator provides a complete written analysis of the assessment design based on the annotated version. All prompts are thoroughly addressed, including alignment</p>	<p>Educator provides a partial analysis of the assessment. Some prompts are addressed, but one or more areas are incomplete or unclear.</p>	<p>Educator does not address the required prompts or provide meaningful analysis of the assessment design.</p>

Eliciting Accurate Evidence of Student Learning

	to purpose, target, sample size, bias, and needed refinements.		
Artifact 4: Analysis of Rubric	Educator provides a complete written analysis of the rubric using the guiding questions. All prompts are addressed, including alignment to target(s), focus, organization, and needed refinements.	Educator addresses some prompts in the analysis, but the explanation is incomplete or lacks clarity.	Educator does not analyze the rubric or fails to respond to the guiding questions.
Artifact 5: Revised Assessment and Rubric	Educator submits clearly annotated revisions to both the assessment and rubric. Changes are explained in a written rationale that connects directly to prior analysis and demonstrates improved alignment and evidence-gathering.	Educator submits annotated revisions and a general explanation of improvements, but rationale may not clearly connect to earlier analysis or explain impact on student learning evidence.	Educator submits annotated revisions with no explanation, or revisions are unclear or unconnected to previous analysis.

Part 3 Reflection

(300 - 500 words)

Please reflect on your learning by answering the questions below. Your responses should demonstrate how the 5-step cycle—designing, annotating, analyzing, and revising your formative assessment and rubric—impacted your thinking and practice.

1. How did your assessment and rubric practices evolve as a result of completing each step of the cycle?
2. How will your revised tools help elicit more accurate evidence of student learning and support meaningful, actionable feedback?
3. In what ways did you consider and apply accommodations or modifications to meet the needs of English Language Learners, Talented and Gifted students, and Students with Disabilities?

Passing: The reflection clearly demonstrates how the learning cycle influenced assessment and rubric practices. The educator includes specific examples from their work—such as design decisions, annotations, analyses, and revisions—to support their reflection. The response also outlines actionable steps for applying this learning in future assessment design and feedback practices.