AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Authentic Assessment Rubric for SIOP® Lesson Plan

Joel R. Montgomery, EdD

University of Phoenix

Authentic Assessment Rubric for SIOP Lesson Plan

This working paper introduces an assessment rubric for a Structured Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP®) lesson plan. The paper begins with a brief review of the context of the assessment rubric, including the background of SIOP, the need for authentic assessments for language minority students, and the usefulness of rubrics to measure students' increasing performance autonomy during scaffolded, sheltered instruction. The paper describes the functional integration of the assessment rubric into the fabric of the SIOP lesson it supports and presents a visual example of the rubric.   The paper concludes with a summary and recommendations for use of the assessment rubric.

Context of the Assessment Rubric

Research indicates that ELLs require five to 10 years of focused education to achieve academic fluency in English (Cummins, 1999). Many states pressure school systems to move ELLs into the mainstream in three years or less (Short, 1993). The consequences of premature movement of ELLs into mainstream classes are being reported by research from mainstream classes (Lenski, Ehlers-Zavala, Daniel, & Sun-Irminger, 2006).

SIOP® is an approach shown to improve academic achievement by English language learners (ELLs) when implemented consistently and systematically (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2004). It contains eight components: preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, practice and application, lesson delivery and review and assessment (Vogt & Echevarria, 2006).

Traditional assessment approaches using multiple choice tests do not accurately measure knowledge acquisition of language minority students. Performance assessment and portfolios, combined, represent authentic assessment. Authentic assessment allows for the integration of

assessment with instruction and opens up a collaborative approach to assessment that enables teachers and students to interact in the teaching/learning process.   This approach enables continuous assessment of student progress and of learning processes and higher-order thinking skills (Hurley & Blake, 2001; Pierce & O'Malley, 1992).

Authentic assessment in SIOP-oriented lessons "is characterized by its application to real life, where students are engaged in meaningful tasks that take place in real-life contexts" (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2004, p. 149). Lesson objectives are framed in terms of both language and content and authentic assessment is integrated seamlessly into the learning activities. Frequently rubrics for these authentic assessments are provided to support meaningful self-assessment as well as criterion-referenced assessment by teachers and peers. Rubric-supported performance assessment can form part of the "Effective Teaching Cycle for English Learners" (2004, p. 145) and leads to additional teaching and learning interventions designed to assist students to achieve performance mastery.

Scaffolding in sheltered instruction for ELLs refers to the gradual release of responsibility from the teacher to the student (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2004; Yoast, 2006). Assessment rubrics for SIOP lessons need to reflect the students' gradual increase in performance autonomy (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 1994; Tomkins, 2008).

Integration of the Assessment Rubric into the Fabric of the SIOP Lesson Plan

The SIOP Lesson Plan

The SIOP lesson supported by this assessment rubric is an introduction to a thematic project focused on early explorers of America. The lesson was designed for eighth grade English language learners (ELLs) at level three (Developing) on the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS) developed by the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA)

Consortium (2008) and approved for use by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) (2004).

While working with this SIOP lesson, students will achieve the lesson's content and language

objectives by working with metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective learning strategies to

make connections between the motivation of these early explorers with the motivation of their

families to leave their countries to come to the United States of America (USA). Students will

initially work in teams with the academic vocabulary for the lesson and will discuss what they

are learning about the motivation of the early explorers. In their next activity they will go to

their families and ask to hear stories about the family's choice to move to the USA. They will

look for motivation in these stories and will retell these stories to their teams. They will

conclude by identifying the connections they and their families share with the motivation of

these early explorers.

Content Objectives in the SIOP Lesson Plan

1. Connect information about the early explorers with their motivation to travel (Illinois
   State Board of Education [ISBE], 2008a).

2. Make connections between the motivation of the early explorers and the motivation of
   "late" explorers (i.e., students' families coming to the USA) (ISBE, 2008a).

3. Compare and contrast the motivation of the early explorers with the motivation of the late
   explorers (students' families) (ISBE, 2008a, 2008b).

Language Objectives in the SIOP Lesson Plan

1. Make predictions about the motivation of early explorers (ISBE, 2008a, WIDA, 2008, p.
   58) (Speaking)

2. Retell stories or events from family histories (WIDA, 2008, p. 58). (Speaking)

3. Locate, select, and order information from oral descriptions (WIDA, 2008, p. 58).

4. Follow multi-step oral directions (WIDA, 2008, p. 58). (Listening)

5. Produce bare-bones expository or narrative texts (WIDA, 2008, p. 58). (Writing)

6. Compare/ contrast information (WIDA, 2008, p. 58). (Writing)

Scaffolding of Instruction

One of the defining characteristics of SIOP-oriented lessons is the scaffolding of instruction, moving performance autonomy from the teacher to the student. The teacher starts by modeling the desired performance. Students begin to practice and to apply what they are learning and continue to receive support from the teacher and their peers until they can perform independently at the targeted levels (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2004; Yoast, 2006).

Description of the Assessment Rubric

The assessment rubric for this lesson (see Table 1, page 9) identifies five key performance criteria for the lesson and allows each to be assessed on the following five-point performance mastery scale in order from lowest to highest:

1. Demonstrates difficulty with understanding the concept in native language (L1) or in English (L2).

2. Understands concept. Competency in L2 forthcoming.

3. Demonstrates competency of skill in L2 with direction.

4. Shows mastery of skill in L2 well with direction.

5. Shows independent mastery of skill in L2 and can peer tutor the skill. [1]

 The five key performance criteria measured by this rubric are:

1. Student uses the academic vocabulary for the lesson with the team

2. Student makes logical prediction of explorers' motivation.

3. Student collects relevant history from the family and retells the family's story to the team.

4. Student makes the connection between the motivation of the family and of the explorers.

5. Student completes a graphic organizer showing the connections between personal, family, and explorers' motivation.

Use of the Assessment Rubric for Lesson Planning and Teaching

Performance assessed by this rubric is tied to the language and content objectives of the lesson. As a student progresses from one level of competence to another, the rubric serves as a tool to guide the teacher to appropriate interventions—including reviews and reteaching opportunities—to assist the student to achieve appropriate performance targets. Depending on the diversity of skill levels within the classroom, some students may be targeted to achieve a performance level below mastery in this lesson—scheduled for early in the school-year. Similar skills can be built into future lessons and growth in performance mastery can be measured again in a subsequent unit using a parallel assessment rubric for that unit. Outputs from the activities being measured by this assessment rubric can be captured (on a computer or on audio or video-tape as well as on paper) and preserved in a student portfolio (paper-based, electronic, or both) which can be used to measure progress throughout the year.

Use of the Assessment Rubric for Self-Assessment and Peer Tutoring

Students working on teams during this lesson can use the same assessment rubric to measure their own progress and to identify opportunities for the team to assist its members in making progress in the learning objectives for the lesson. When they see a team member having challenges at the lower end of the performance mastery scale, they can see the teacher modeling

intervention behaviors and can copy similar behaviors, gradually taking on more responsibility

for their own learning and growth within the team (Kasper & Weiss, 2005).

Summary and Recommendations

This working paper introduced an assessment rubric for a Structured Instruction

Observation Protocol (SIOP®) lesson plan. The paper began with a brief review of the context of

the assessment rubric, including the background of SIOP, the need for authentic assessments for

language minority students, and the usefulness of rubrics to measure students' increasing

performance autonomy during scaffolded, sheltered instruction. The paper described the

functional integration of the assessment rubric into the fabric of the SIOP lesson it supports and

presented a visual example of the rubric. The paper concluded with a summary and

recommendations for use of the assessment rubric.

Recommendations for Use of the Assessment Rubric

The assessment rubric created for this SIOP lesson allows for the integration of

assessment with instruction and opens up a collaborative approach to assessment allowing

students and teachers to interact in the teaching and learning process. It also supports continuous

assessment of student progress and serves as a collaborative tool to be used for dialog between

students, peers, teachers, administrators and parents. Tied to lesson objectives and to Illinois

state learning standards for ELP, social science, and social-emotional learning, progress

measured by this assessment reflects authentic growth in areas of interest by the state and by the

school and the community it supports. Student outputs being assessed by this rubric can be

collected into student portfolios to track progress over time and to serve as a base for discussion

with interested participants in the learning process. Subsequent lessons can incorporate modified

versions of this assessment rubric to insure that student progress in important areas of

performance mastery is scaffolded throughout the year and receives ongoing review and support.

Table 1—Assessment Rubric-Explorers' Motivation—Early and Late

Assessment Rubric	Demonstrates difficulty with understanding the concept in L1 or L2.	Understands concept, competency in L2 forthcoming	Demonstrates competency of skill in L2 with direction	Shows mastery of skill in L2 well with direction	Shows independent mastery of skill in L2 and can peer-tutor the skill.[1]
Student uses the academic vocabulary for the lesson with the team.	Student demonstrates little understanding of the vocabulary in team conversations.	Student demonstrates understanding of concepts and cannot communicate this understanding in team conversations.	With frequent support, student can use this vocabulary fluently in team conversations.	Supported by occasional cueing, student uses the vocabulary appropriately in team conversations.	Student uses the vocabulary fluently and provides cueing and direction in its use to other team members.
Student makes logical prediction of the explorers' motivation.	Prediction is without logic and has no base of support in text.	Prediction is logical and student has difficulty communicating its base of support in the text.	Student makes logical prediction and, with extensive guidance, shows base of support in the text.	Student makes logical prediction and needs infrequent cueing to show base of support in the text.	Student makes logical predictions supported by the text and assists others with timely cues and support.
Student collects relevant history from the family and retells their story to the team.	Student is unable to frame questions to collect relevant information from family.	Student collects relevant information and cannot process the information in the team conversations.	Student collects relevant information and, with support, retells the story to the team.	Student collects relevant information and, with minimal cueing, retells the story to the team.	Student collects relevant information, communicates it effectively to the team, and supports the team appropriately.
Student makes the connection between the motivation of the family and of the explorers.	Student is unable to find the motivation or to make the connections.	Student recognizes the motivation and is unable to make the connection or to communicate to the team.	With support, student recognizes the motivation, makes the connection, and communicates it to the team.	With minimal cueing, student recognizes the motivation, makes the connection, and communicates it to the team.	Student recognizes the motivation, makes the connection, and communicates it to the team. Student supports the team appropriately.
Student completes a graphic organizer showing the connections between personal, family, and explorers' motivation.	Student is not able to complete the graphic organizer or the organizer does not show the three connections.	Student recognizes the connections and cannot communicate the ideas on the graphic organizer.	Student, with support, completes the graphic organizer and shows three connections.	Student, with minimal cueing, completes the graphic organizer and shows three connections.	Student completes the graphic organizer and shows the three connections. Student supports the team appropriately.

(Adapted from Tomkins, 2008, p. 7)

References

Cummins, J. (1999, January 1). *BICS and CALP: Clarifying the Distinction*. . (ERIC Document

Reproduction Service No. ED438551) Retrieved June 12, 2008, from ERIC database.

Echevarria, J.; Vogt, M.E., & Short, D.J. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English

learners: the SIOP model,* 2nd Ed. New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.

Hurly, S.R. & Blake, S. (2001). Assessment in the content areas for students acquiring English.

In Hurly, S.R. & Tinajero, J.F. *Literacy assessment of second language learners.* Boston,

MA: Allyn & Bacon, pp. 84-103.

Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). (2008a, Goal 16). Illinois learning standards: Social

Science. Retrieved on June 20, 2008, from

http://www.isbe.net/ils/social_science/standards.htm.

Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). (2008b). Illinois learning standards: Social-Emotional

Learning.   Retrieved on June 20, 2008, from

http://www.isbe.net/ils/social_emotional/standards.htm.

Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). (2004). EL proficiency standards presentation,

March11, 2004. Retrieved on June 13, 2008, from

http://www.isbe.net/bilingual/pdfs/el_proficiency_standards_presentation.pdf .

Kasper, L.F. & Weiss, S.T. (2005). Building ESL students' linguistic and academic literacy

through content-based interclass collaboration. *Teaching English in the Two Year

College, 32*(3), pp. 282-297. Retrieved June 10, 2008, from ProQuest Education Journals

database. (Document ID: 815240841).

Lenski, S.D.; Ehlers-Zavala, F.; Daniel, M.C. & Sun-Irminger, X. (2006, September). Assessing

    English language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Reading Teacher, 60*(1), pp.

    24-34. Retrieved June 4, 2008, doi:10.1598/RT.60.1.3.

Pierce, L.V. & O'Malley, J.M. (1992, Spring). Performance and portfolio assessment for

    language minority students. *NCBE Program Information Guide Series, 9.* Retrieved on

    June 22, 2008, from

    http://qcpages.qc.cuny.edu/ECP/bilingualcenter/Newsletters/PerfAssessmentV2-1.pdf.

Short, D.J. (1993, Winter). Assessing integrated language and content instruction. *TESOL*

    Quarterly, 27(4), pp. 627-656. Retrieved June 22, 2008, from Stable URL:

    http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587399.

Tomkins, D. (2008). Week 2 Lecture. Retrieved on June 16, 2008, from Course Materials

    thread, University of Phoenix Class Forum, TESL 533, Methods for English as a Second

    Language Course Website.

Vogt, M.E. & Echevarria, J. (2006). *Teaching ideas for implementing the SIOP® model.*

    Glenview, IL: Pearson Achievement Solutions.

World-Class Instruction Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium. (2008a). English

    language performance standards resource guide. Retrieved June 15, 2008, from

    http://www.wida.us/standards/Resource_Guide_web.pdf.

Yoast, M. (2006, November). *Thoughtful literacy: conversations for learning* [PowerPoint

    slides]. Rigby/Steck-Vaughn. Retrieved on June 21, 2008, from

    www.magonline.org/Thoughtful_Literacy_-_MAG.ppt.

---

[1] Peer tutoring is actually a separate skill that is assessed elsewhere. It is included here because the coaching elements for the skill have continually been modeled by the teacher as the student builds performance mastery and autonomy. This framework was suggested in Tomkins (2008, p. 7) and included a provision for peer tutoring at the mastery level.