Maine Department of Education

Maine Exhibitions Assessment Project

September 2002 – June 2004

Technical Criteria for Including Exhibition Assessments in Comprehensive Local Assessment Systems

Technical Criteria Revised October 2003 and May 2004

Maine Exhibitions Assessment Project
June 2004

Technical Criteria for Including Exhibition Assessments in Comprehensive Local Assessment Systems

Table of Contents

Part I:
Background of Exhibition Assessment Project and Creation of Committees

In September 2002, the Maine Department of Education began organizing an Exhibition Assessment Advisory Committee whose purpose it was to consider meaningful ways to include exhibition assessments in comprehensive local assessment systems. School administrators were invited to participate and/or nominate practitioners in their districts to become involved in this committee's work.

Through earlier informal discussions and DOE surveys related to assessment practices, it was clear that a number of approaches to exhibition assessments are currently being used throughout the state of Maine - ranging from a four-year continuum to a senior year semester, from graduation requirements to course-embedded requirements, and many variations in between. While exhibition assessments are primarily in practice at the secondary level, many middle and elementary schools also value and use exhibitions to integrate curriculum and assess the skills and knowledge of their students.

Preliminary investigations of implementation approaches across districts showed no consistency of assessment practices being used with exhibition assessments. Additionally, the intent to align assessment criteria to Maine's content standards and performance indicators was more the exception to the rule than the rule that guided local assessment of exhibitions.

The members of Maine DOE's Local Assessment Team reviewed the Exhibitions Project proposal during the summer of 2002 and recommended that the technical criteria developed through this project be appropriate for all grade spans; use *Measured Measures* as a source document to guide the committees' work; and address the need for alignment with Maine's *Learning Results* to assure content validity and reliability. It was also determined at that time that committees be formed to represent schools from a range of grade spans, geographic areas, school population sizes, and economic diversity.

Goals of the Exhibition Assessment Project:

- To develop criteria for technical considerations for exhibition assessments included as part of local assessment systems;
- To review and provide models and strategies for the implementation of exhibition assessments; and
- To promote the unique features of exhibitions (e.g., authentic performances, broader audiences, varied products, self-directed learning) and to assure their reliability and validity.

Year 1 Activities
Process for Developing Technical Criteria

Meeting dates and tasks for the Exhibitions Advisory Committee

Two full-day meetings were held which included the Advisory Committee. At the September 2002 meeting, a subgroup was created – the Exhibitions Work Group – consisting of about 10 –15 practitioners from the Advisory Committee schools/districts. Tasks for the Work Group were identified, including:

- Reviewing literature on current exhibition approaches;
- Discussing related assessment readings to clarify validity, reliability, and equity aspects;
- Reviewing and sharing models currently being implemented; and
- Providing input on development of technical criteria.

In December 2002, the Advisory Committee reconvened to review draft technical criteria and feedback from attendees at the Promising Futures Conference, making revisions to the draft document. The Exhibitions Advisory Committee also developed and/or validated recommendations related to technical support needed for implementation and for conducting a pilot of various models during the 2003-2004 school year.

In addition to the Advisory Committee meetings, the Exhibitions Work Group met three full days on:

- October 2, 2002: to begin to define features of exhibition assessments and the rationale for including exhibitions in local assessment systems; and to review models and examples currently in use.
- October 31, 2002: to address content validity and alignment with Maine's content standards and performance indicators; and to share and review models and examples in use.
- November 14, 2002: to refine the draft document for broader dissemination and feedback; to identify implementation support activities; and to consider procedures for conducting future pilots, field trials, and benchmarking of assessment anchors.

Several schools represented on the Advisory and Work Committees also made presentations, sharing their school's approaches to exhibition assessments at the December 2002 Promising Futures Conference: Bringing Student Exhibitions Alive!

Under the direction of Pam Rolfe, Local Assessment Coordinator, the following people assisted in this work:

- Karin Hess, Center for Assessment, facilitated and provided technical guidance and related readings to the committees; provided updates on the committees' work to LAPT and TAC; presented draft technical guidelines and reviewed feedback from high schools attending the Promising Futures Conference; and prepared the draft technical criteria document, incorporating Advisory and Work Committees' recommendations.
- Estelle Sanders and Marsha Cottrell developed committee lists; validated links to *MLR* standards and assured continuity with the DOE's overall local assessment work; arranged meeting sites, developed and disseminated agendas and readings; compiled work session feedback comments; and made any needed contacts necessary for coordination of activities.
- Connie Manter coordinated the conference presentations on exhibitions and the gathering of feedback on draft criteria at the Promising Futures Conference, held December 10, 2002 in Augusta, Maine.

Schools involved in Year 1 (2002-2003)

Not all of the schools invited to participate were able to due to time constraints and prior commitments. The following schools, districts, and/or organizations were represented on the Exhibitions Advisory and Work Committees:

Gorham Village School
Maine Mathematics and Science Alliance (MMSA)
Messalonskee High School and elementary school (SAD 47)
Mt. Abram High School (SAD 58)
Mt. Desert Island High School (Union 98)
Poland Regional High School (Union 29)
Telstar High School (SAD 44)
The New School
Waldo Technical Center (WCTC)
Maine Department of Education staff

Year 2 Activities
Revisions to Technical Criteria, Development of an Adaptation Protocol, and Implementation Activities

During the second year of the exhibitions project, the technical criteria were refined, an exhibition adaptation protocol tool was developed, and many schools (represented on the Exhibitions Advisory Committee) piloted exhibition assessments in their schools. The committee met four times during the 2003-2004 school year. The first two full-day meetings focused on a review of the draft technical criteria and use of the draft exhibition adaptation protocol. During these sessions, schools had the opportunity to apply the draft criteria to their schools' exhibition planning and receive critical feedback, as well as offer comments for refining the technical criteria. The third session, held in March 2004, provided time and support to work with colleagues to develop or refine local assessment rubrics, plan local assessment training sessions for this year's exhibitions, or work on the logistics of setting up exhibitions. The final session (June 2004) featured a sharing of models and personal reflections on the exhibition assessment process. Some Exhibition Advisory Committee members also made short presentations to showcase their schools' exhibition activities.

Schools involved in Year 2 (2003-2004)

The Exhibitions Advisory Committee expanded during the 2003-2004 school year to include some schools/districts involved with year 1 activities and some new participants. The following schools, districts, and/or organizations were represented on the Exhibitions Advisory and Work Committees during 2003-2004:

Brunswick Schools – Jordan Acres Elementary School
Falmouth Schools – Plummer- Motz Elementary School
Hall-Dale High School
Kennebunk High School
KIDS Consortium
Machias High School
Mid-Coast School of Technology
Mt. Abram High School (SAD 58)
Mt. Desert Island High School (Union 98)
Oak Hill High School
Poland Regional High School and Middle School (Union 29)
Sanford High School
Southern Maine Partnership
Windham Middle School
Maine Mathematics and Science Alliance (MMSA)
Maine Department of Education staff

Part II: Rationale for including Exhibitions in Local Assessment Systems

Defining Exhibitions and their Role in Local Assessment Systems

Using *Measured Measures* (pages 1-5) and example exhibitions currently in practice to guide the discussion, committees began to define exhibition assessments and explore the role they might play in local assessment systems. Six areas described in *Measured Measures* were reviewed and considered in developing a rationale for including exhibition assessments in local assessment systems:

- **The assessments collectively are relevant to announced learning targets.**
- **The assessments are conducted at multiple levels: classroom, school, district, and state.**
- **The assessments are conducted at multiple grades.**
- **The assessments draw on multiple methods – "traditional" and "alternative" alike.**
- **The assessment system allows for multiple opportunities to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and skill development.**
- **The assessments have an announced rationale.**

The following pages reflect the synthesis of ideas related to the role of exhibitions within local assessment systems and eight distinct features of exhibitions. The features were created and have continued to be refined to better define and guide development of and/or adaptation of current models for inclusion of exhibitions in local assessment systems. Additionally, a Protocol for Adapting Exhibitions to meet technical criteria was developed in 2003, and is available upon request.

The detailed descriptions of each feature that follow the Summary of Eight Features of Exhibitions and Role of Exhibitions attempt to outline local decisions related to each feature, provide a variety of appropriate examples, and identify alignment with Maine's *Learning Results* for assessment purposes. Use of *Measured Measures* (pages 7 – 17) shaped the discussion of content validity.

Summary of Eight Features of Exhibitions

FEATURE 1:
Exhibitions, by their nature, require a "public sharing" of learning.

FEATURE 2:
Exhibitions require an active role of the learner and provide opportunities for student choice and voice, within established school/district parameters.

FEATURE 3:
Exhibitions highlight the "new learning" gained when answering a question through research/exploration. Exhibitions require a synthesis of ideas using strategic thinking, reasoning, and planning.

FEATURE 4:
Exhibitions include a range of artifacts that demonstrates and documents learning, including: an oral presentation and defense; support of ideas through appropriate research/exploration of topic; and evidence (tangible products, performances, etc.) demonstrating depth of learning.

FEATURE 5:
At minimum, three aspects -- presentation skills, content knowledge, and research/process skills -- are assessed through exhibitions as summative assessments. Each assessment is linked to *Maine's Learning Results* through alignment with specific performance indicators, assuring content validity in the local assessment system. Other aspects of exhibitions may employ either formative or summative assessments.

FEATURE 6:
Exhibitions include the student's purposeful critical reflection on what was learned.

FEATURE 7:
Assessment feedback for exhibitions is done by consensus and comes from multiple sources, which may include: peers, content experts, mentors/advisors, school instructional staff/teachers, and the broader general audience.

FEATURE 8: (optional feature)
Some schools/districts may also opt to assess the quality of feedback given to the exhibition presenter *by his/her peers*. This is an opportunity to collect additional assessment data (*on students other than the exhibition presenter*) during the exhibition assessment process.

Role of Exhibitions in Local Assessment Systems

Rationale for Including Exhibitions

Exhibitions focus on the public sharing and celebration of new learning, and are appropriate for all students. Exhibitions demand a level of creativity, rigor, and student investment not possible with most other forms of assessment. They provide opportunities for teachers to witness how students can integrate content knowledge and demonstrate understanding and skill development in unique ways.

Because of its comprehensiveness, an exhibition promotes both depth of learning and student choice in determining learning goals. Learners, teachers, and the greater learning community take a variety of active roles in exhibition assessments, collectively developing a better understanding of what learning looks like and what the school community values. In addition to being an effective assessment method, exhibitions promote community involvement with and support for learning.

Exhibitions Have Relevance to Announced Learning Targets

Exhibitions are relevant to announced learning targets and provide evidence of student performance, in terms of measurable outcomes. Collectively, the multiple performance indicators, assessed though exhibitions during a student's school career, can be valuable in demonstrating achievement of Maine's *Learning Results*.

Local decisions about including exhibitions in local assessment systems should consider: making relevant connections to the K-12 curriculum; developing an assessment continuum across grade levels for exhibitions; and developing ways to analyze and interpret assessment results to inform teaching and learning.

Exhibitions are Conducted at Multiple Levels & Multiple Grades

Exhibition assessments can be initiated at the school and/or district levels, involving students across multiple classrooms. Learning experiences with exhibitions could happen at every grade level, throughout the students' school careers. At the classroom level, teachers introduce and provide practice and feedback in developing the knowledge and skills needed to successfully complete the different components of exhibitions. Ongoing classroom instruction in communication and research skills allow for continuous opportunities to integrate content knowledge and self-assess performance.

More formalized exhibition assessments, implemented as part of the local assessment system, could occur within any grade span, at least once during the elementary, middle, and high school grades. Teaching staff within the grade spans share responsibility for monitoring and evaluating effective use of exhibitions.

Exhibitions Draw on Multiple Methods

Inherent in the process of exhibitions are the roles of formative and summative methods of assessment. Local decisions will be made about the appropriate uses of assessment feedback from peers, content experts, mentors/advisors, and/or teachers, as well as critical self-reflection on the learning process.

Exhibitions Features and Alignment with Maine's *Learning Results*

FEATURE 1:
Exhibitions, by their nature, require a "public sharing" of learning.

The audience extends beyond the "typical classroom audience" [peers and teacher(s)] to a broader learning community.

Some Examples …

- The audience for Senior Graduation Exhibitions includes students in the junior class, parents, business and community mentors who have worked closely with students, and school staff.
- Students researching public issues make public presentations to local or regional agencies, (e.g., zoning boards, environmental commissions, school board of commissioners, etc.) and/or publish findings for review and critique (e.g., in editorials written for local newspapers, posted on appropriate Internet websites for content review, public service announcements on local radio station, etc.).
- Review panels, made up of a content expert, teacher(s) from other classrooms, and an advisor/mentor are present for the presentation and also provide assessment feedback to the presenter.
- Third graders from one school/classroom make their presentations to a review panel made up of some parents and teachers of third graders of another school/classroom. Then the process is reversed.
- Students broadcast exhibitions over ATM (distance learning network) and respond to questions from the audience about their projects.

Local Decisions to be Made:

How broad should the audience be?

Who are the appropriate audience for our exhibitions? (Consider: age of presenters, the content focus and "authentic" audience for the topic, etc.)

In what ways can the sharing and feedback to presenter occur?

FEATURE 2:
Exhibitions require an active role of the learner, through providing opportunities for student choice and voice, within established school/district parameters.

Exhibitions provide students with some choice and responsibility in shaping the (content, process, or product) focus of their exhibitions. Student voice is evidenced in how the learning is personalized, the ways in which the learning is shared publicly, or how the "audience" is invited to participate in the sharing.

Some Examples …

- A school district designs exhibitions to occur at elementary, middle, and high school levels as part of the science and social studies curriculums. The broad science or social studies content is identified for students, but individual choices of research questions about the content are provided within the set parameters. This assures allocating ample resources and class time for conducting research/explorations and presentations.
- High school students are required to use technology in their presentations and to identify a community mentor or content expert to network with while working on their projects. Guidelines are provided for how to document research activities. Students select their own topics (making links to Maine's Content Standards) and determine the format for presentations and artifacts.

Local Decisions to be Made:

What parameters has the school/district set for exhibitions? Are they linked to specific content or process curriculum goals?

Do the school's parameters allow for student choice, either in content/topic focus, research/exploration process, or products of learning?

How is student "voice" – personalizing learning - encouraged? How will the "audience" actively participate?

FEATURE 3:

Exhibitions highlight the "new learning" gained when answering a question through research/exploration. Exhibitions require a synthesis of ideas using strategic thinking, reasoning, and planning.

New learning is defined as including, but not limited to: transfer, application, or in-depth analysis/synthesis of prior learning in a new context; solving and justifying a non-routine problem having potential multiple solutions; developing a new model for a complex problem; designing and carrying out an extended investigation; making connections across content areas or concepts.

Some Examples …

- Middle school students design and conduct their own field study or controlled experiment to learn more about a science concept being studied.
- High school students conduct interviews and review historical documents and artifacts, in order to gather enough information to propose alternatives to current local/state land use, economic, or health policies.
- Elementary students use what they have learned about the process of invention to identify an existing need and design a technological solution or create and demonstrate a strategy to address the need.
- Students explore an art medium new to them, creating an original product or performance that demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the medium.
- High school students pose an "essential question" on a topic of their choosing and conduct extensive research/exploration to answer the question.

Local Decisions to be Made:

How will teachers, advisors/mentors, and content experts guide students' planning and question-posing skills in order to develop meaningful and rigorous explorations (e.g., direct instruction, mentoring, regular conferencing times, etc.)?

Are there appropriate existing models to share with students (e.g., Creative Problem Solving, Scientific method, etc.)?

FEATURE 4:

Exhibitions include a range of artifacts that demonstrates and documents learning, including: an oral presentation and defense; support of ideas through appropriate research/exploration of topic; and evidence (tangible products, performances, etc.) demonstrating depth of learning.

Some Examples …

- In preparation for exhibitions, elementary students (and their panel of assessors) are given three questions they should be able to answer during the "defense" portion of the presentations.
- All of the seventh grade students select artifacts from their exhibitions to display at a "Celebration of Learning" held at the end of the marking period. Students are on hand to explain to other students and parents what they learned and the process they used to learn it.
- A high school requires that Senior Exhibitions include: a formal written paper, oral presentation and defense, documentation of related community service, and one tangible product of learning to be displayed for the public.

Local Decisions to be Made:

Will additional products - written (logs, journals, reports), technological, and/or visual (graphic representations, posters, etc.) components - also be required?

How will each component be assessed?

How will students be prepared to "defend" their ideas and new learning?

Has the "product" to be assessed (source of evidence) been identified on the rubric?

FEATURE 5:
At minimum, three aspects -- presentation skills, content knowledge, and research/process skills -- are assessed through exhibitions as summative assessments. Each assessment is linked to *Maine's Learning Results* through alignment with specific performance indicators, assuring content validity in the local assessment system. Exhibitions allow for a variety of opportunities to integrate content knowledge, communication skills, research, and self-assessment of performance.

- **5A: Assessing overall presentation -communication skills & clarity of content**

MAINE CONTENT STANDARD and Assessment Criteria for exhibition presentations*:

English Language Arts, G: Stylistic and Rhetorical Aspects of Writing and Speaking
Possible Performance Indicators:

- **(Grades 3-4) Elementary #6:** Explain how speakers use physical gestures and eye contact and use this knowledge in their own presentations.
- **(Grades 3-4) Elementary #7:** Use a variety of media and technological resources to make creative and expository oral presentations.

- **Middle # 10:** Deliver oral presentations that use a variety of strategies of address (e.g., eye contact, hand gestures, voice modulation, changes of rhythm).
- **Middle #4:** Write essays and deliver oral presentations that identify a clear topic, and reliably support that topic.

- **Secondary # 9:** Write essays and deliver oral presentations that reliably support and provide details for the explicitly stated generalizations
- **Secondary # 10:** Make effective use of a variety of techniques to provide supporting details (e.g., analogies, anecdotes, illustrations, detailed descriptions, restatements, paraphrases, examples, comparisons) in written work and oral presentations.

MAINE CONTENT STANDARD and Assessment Criterion for exhibition presentations*:

English Language Arts, H: Research-Related Writing and Speaking
Possible Performance Indicator:

- **Secondary #12:** Report orally, using a variety of technological resources to present the results of a research project.

Local Decisions to be Made:
Are the indicators above appropriate for assessing our exhibitions?
*Is there an appropriate oral presentation and/or communication performance indicator for a different content standard, which could be substituted OR added to those identified in English Language Arts (G and H)?
How many performance indicators should we be assessing at this time in the students' school career?
Which performance indicators will be identified for assessing for oral presentation?
Who will assess presentation skills and delivery of content?
How will we prepare the assessors to ensure reliability of scoring?

FEATURE 5 (continued):

- **5 B: Assessing content knowledge specific to the topic/problem chosen**

MAINE CONTENT STANDARD(s) – Identify Assessment Criteria for content**

Local Decisions to be Made:
Does the content focus cut across content disciplines or across related performance indicators?
Is integration of content areas one of our goals for Exhibitions?
**Which specific content standards and performance indicators closely relate to the exhibition topic and goals of the research question AND should be used as the assessment criteria?
Have we identified appropriate content experts? Who will assess content for accuracy?
How will we prepare the assessors to ensure reliability of scoring?

- **5 C: Assessing process/research skills appropriate to the content selected**

MAINE CONTENT STANDARD and Assessment Criteria for research*:**

English Language Arts, H: Research-Related Writing and Speaking: *Students will work, write, and speak effectively when doing research in all content areas.*
(Performance indicators for each grade span will vary according to research topic chosen.)
Possible Performance Indicators:

- **(Grades 3-4) Elementary #2:** Use print and non-print resources to gather information on research topics.
- **(Grades 3-4) Elementary #4:** Distinguish between facts encountered in documents…

- **Middle # 1:** Collect and synthesize data for research topics from interviews and field work…
- **Middle # 2:** Separate information collected from research topics into major components…
- **Middle # 6:** Use magazines, newspapers, dictionaries …to gather information for research topics.

- **Secondary #3:** Record significant information…
- **Secondary #5:** Use government publications, in-depth field studies, and almanacs for research.
- **Secondary #7:** Identify and use a variety news sources … for research purposes.
- **Secondary #10:** Analyze the validity and weigh the reliability of…
- **Secondary #11:** Evaluate information for accuracy, currency, and possible bias.

Local Decisions to be Made:
Which performance indicators for ELA H are most appropriate for assessing the exhibition process in our school?
***Is there is an appropriate research process performance indicator for a different content standard, which could be substituted for those identified in English Language Arts (H) above?
Who will assess process/research skills? How will we prepare the assessors to ensure reliability of scoring?

FEATURE 5: (Continued) Possible alternative content standards

Some alternative content standards for assessing the research/exploration process are listed below. Performance indicators for each grade span and content standard will vary according to research topic chosen.

- **Social Studies, History C: Historical Inquiry, Analysis, and Interpretation:** Students will learn to evaluate resource material such as documents, artifacts, maps, artworks, and literature, and make judgments about the perspectives of the authors and their credibility when interpreting current historical events.
- **Science and Technology, J: Inquiry and Problem Solving:** Students will apply inquiry and problem solving approaches in science and technology.
- **Mathematics, J: Mathematical Reasoning:** Students will understand and apply concepts of mathematical reasoning.
- **Health and Physical Education, Health B: Health Information, Services, and Products**: Students will know how to acquire valid information about health issues, services, and products.

FEATURE 6:

Exhibitions include the student's purposeful critical reflection on what was learned.

This may be a formative or summative assessment, using a written component (such as learning log or reflective essay), an oral interview, questioning during the defense of the oral presentation, or any other appropriate means.
Student reflections should include:

- ✓ What? (What did I already know and what have I learned?)
- ✓ So What? (Why is this learning important to me, or to others?)
- ✓ Now What? (What can I do now with this new learning?)

➢ Assessing critical reflection for exhibitions:

MAINE CONTENT STANDARD and Assessment Criterion for personal reflection on new learning

English Language Arts, D: Informational Texts **(including both print and non-print texts)**
Possible Performance Indicator:
(Grades 3-4) Elementary #7: Recognize how and when new information in a text connects to prior knowledge.

Middle #6: Describe new knowledge presented in informational texts and how it can be used.

Secondary # 6: Explain how new information from a text changes personal knowledge.

OR, if more appropriate, use the performance indicator below at the elementary grade span:
CONTENT STANDARD and Assessment Criterion: Personal reflection on new learning

English Language Arts, E: Process of Writing and Speaking
Possible Performance Indicator:
(Grades 3-4) Elementary #4: Report orally and summarize personal discoveries they have made as a result of reading and viewing.

Local Decisions to be Made:
How will the exhibition be structured so that students are guided to reflect on their learning along the way?
What format will be used to assess critical reflection?
Who will assess critical reflection? How will we prepare the assessors to ensure reliability of scoring?

FEATURE 7:
Assessment feedback for exhibitions is done by consensus and comes from multiple sources, which may include: peers, content experts, mentors/advisors, school instructional staff/teachers, and the broader general audience.

"Content Experts" generally extend beyond the regular classroom teacher, and may have content (specific subject area knowledge), process (research), and/or product (product-specific technological skill) expertise. A content expert can assure the accuracy of content, provide resources and feedback on appropriate application of research skills, or give critical feedback on development of tangible products/performances that demonstrate significant learning.

Peer feedback may be useful to the exhibition presenter either during a "dress rehearsal" or preliminary exhibition phase (as a formative assessment) or during the actual oral presentation and defense phase (as part of a summative assessment).

Some Examples of Content Experts …

- One content expert works with an individual student, a small group of students, or with an entire class, depending on the topic of study. This is done in person or over the Internet.
- Students are required to "network" with content experts as part of their research process.
- Potential content experts include**:** a person working in a related field, at a college/university, or at a government agency; a community member with specific knowledge or expertise; an older student with specific knowledge or expertise; instructional staff/teachers within or at another school/district.

Some Examples of Peers …

- Classmates and students in the same grade span within in the school or district make up the audience of exhibitions and give summative feedback to presenters on the clarity of their topics.
- Students in the same grade span in another school/district, of a partner school using a comparable exhibition process, give formative feedback on content and process, using a school website.

Local Decisions to be Made:
How will we define the assessment roles of peers, parents, content experts, and mentors/advisors for our exhibitions? (For example, advisors/mentors generally provide formative assessment along the way, helping students to document their process.)
If including peer feedback, will it be formative or summative?
How will we assure that there is consistency of interpretation of assessment criteria and reliability in scoring for different assessors? (For example, how will rubrics and benchmark/anchor papers be introduced, clarified for scorers, and used in scoring?)

FEATURE 8: (Optional)
Assessment feedback from peers may be assessed for quality using Maine's Content Standards/Performance Indicators. This feature focuses on (and assesses) peers giving feedback to the exhibition presenter.

The use of peer assessment is appropriate for districts wanting a systemic approach to providing for and assessing the quality of peer feedback during exhibitions. Peer feedback may be useful to the exhibition presenter either during a "dress rehearsal" or preliminary exhibition phase (formative assessment) or during the actual oral presentation and defense phase (as part of a summative assessment).

- **<u>Assessing peer feedback in the exhibitions process:</u>**

  MAINE CONTENT STANDARD and Assessment Criterion for peer feedback

  English Language Arts, E. Process of Writing and Speaking
  Possible Performance Indicators:
  (Grades 3-4) Elementary #6: Summarize central concepts from oral presentations.

  Middle #3: Ask questions and apply personal interpretations in class discussion following speeches and oral presentations.

  Secondary #4: Evaluate the remarks and oral presentations of others to find key ideas, and explain the ways in which these ideas were developed.

Local Decisions to be Made:
Will our school/district formally develop and assess a peer feedback aspect?
Will peer feedback be a formative or summative assessment?
How will we assure that there is consistency of interpretation of assessment criteria and reliability in scoring for different assessors? (For example, how will rubrics and benchmark/anchor papers be introduced, clarified for scorers, and used in scoring?)

Elementary Level Planning Worksheet for Exhibition Assessment: _____
Grades PK-4: List Grade Level ____ (NOTE: Performance Indicators listed below are for the Elementary Grades 3-4)

Exhibition Aspects to be Assessed	**FEATURE # 5 Exhibition Topic – Content Focus**			**FEATURE # 5 Overall Presentation and Defense**		**FEATURE # 5 Research**	**FEATURE # 6 Critical Reflection**	**FEATURE # 8 Peer Feedback (Optional to Assess)**
Content Standards Assessed				**ELA-G (possible indicators)**	**Other Content Standard?**	**ELA-H (possible indicators)**	**ELA-D (possible indicators)**	**ELA-E (possible indicators)**
Performance Indicators (Elementary grades 3-4)				❑ **#6** Strategies ❑ **#7** Resources		❑ **#2 or** ❑ **#4**	❑ **#7** Recognize how & when…	❑ **#6** Summarize central concepts…
Alternative to Content Standard/PI (listed)							❑ **ELA-E #4** Report & summarize	
Formative (F) or Summative (S) Assessment?	**S**			**S**		**S**		
FEATURE # 4 Source of Evidence (for each component assessed)								
FEATURE # 7 Who will assess this component?								
NOTES:								

Middle Level Planning Worksheet for Exhibition Assessment: _____

List Grade Level ____ (NOTE: Performance Indicators listed below are for the Middle Grades 5-8)

Exhibition Aspects to be Assessed	**FEATURE # 5 Exhibition Topic – Content Focus**			**FEATURE # 5 Overall Presentation and Defense**		**FEATURE # 5 Research**	**FEATURE # 6 Critical Reflection**	**FEATURE # 8 Peer Feedback (Optional to Assess)**
Exhibition Aspects to be Assessed				**ELA-G (possible indicators)**	**Other Content Standard?**	**ELA-H (possible indicators)**	**ELA-D (possible indicators)**	**ELA-E (possible indicators)**
Content Standards Assessed				❑ #10 Strategies ❑ #4 Support topic		❑ #1 Collect & synthesize ❑ #2 Separate information ❑ #6 Use sources	❑ **#6** Describe new knowledge	❑ #3 Ask questions; interpret
Performance Indicators (Elementary grades 3-4)								
Alternative to Content Standard/PI (listed)	**S**			**S**		**S**		
Formative (F) or Summative (S) Assessment?								
FEATURE # 4 Source of Evidence (for each component assessed)								
NOTES:								

Secondary Planning Worksheet for Exhibition Assessment: _____

List Grade Level ____ (NOTE: Performance Indicators listed below are for the Secondary Grades)

Exhibition Aspects to be Assessed	**FEATURE # 5** **Exhibition Topic – Content Focus**			**FEATURE # 5** **Overall Presentation and Defense**		**FEATURE # 5** **Research**	**FEATURE # 6** **Critical Reflection**	**FEATURE # 8** **Peer Feedback** **(Optional to Assess)**
Content Standards Assessed				**ELA-G (possible indicators)**	**ELA-H (possible indicators)**	**ELA-H (possible indicators)**	**ELA D (possible indicators)**	**ELA E (possible indicators)**
Performance Indicators **(Elementary grades 3-4)**				❑ #10 Strategies ❑ #9 Support topic	❑ #12 Use of technology	❑ #3 ❑ #5 ❑ #7 ❑ #10 ❑ #11	❑ #6 Explain how …	❑ #4 Evaluate remarks…
Alternative to Content Standard/PI (listed)								
Formative (F) or Summative (S) Assessment?	**S**			**S**		**S**		
FEATURE # 4 **Source of Evidence** (for each component assessed)								
FEATURE # 7 **Who will assess this component?**								
NOTES:								