

THE UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION  
*Summer II 2013*

**Education 5310: Graduate Seminar in Foundational Studies (Foundations of Assessment)**

---

**MTWRF 1-3:50, TH 241**

**Instructor:** Dr. David Slomp

**Office:** TH 306

**Phone:** (403) 329 2455

**E-mail:** [david.slomp@uleth.ca](mailto:david.slomp@uleth.ca)

**Secretary:** Margaret Beintema

**Phone:** (403) 329-2732

**Calendar Description:**

An interdisciplinary analysis of the evolution of modern educational theory and practice as it relates to the field of assessment.

**Course Objectives:**

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. Define a range of perspectives on assessment, linking these perspectives to evolving understandings of concepts central to the discipline.
2. Explicate insights into the challenges and affordances of rearticulating assessment practices;
3. Articulate a personal understanding of assessment grounded in those insights;
4. Apply these insights to relevant assessment issues in their professional context.

**Required Resource:**

McMillan, J. H. (2013). *The Sage Handbook on Classroom Assessment*. Washington: Sage Publications Inc.

This is available in the University of Lethbridge bookstore.

**Statement of Purpose:**

Assessment of student learning is among the most important and most complex responsibilities teachers engage in when working with students. The purpose of this foundations course is to explore the complex history of classroom assessment practices, to develop an understanding of the philosophical perspectives that have shaped this history, and to unpack the key terms that shape and inform current assessment practices. The goal of this course is not to provide you with a "how to" guide to classroom assessment practices, but rather to deepen your understanding of the intellectual frameworks that have shaped assessment practices, so that this understanding will help to inform the assessment work you undertake in your district, school and classroom. Throughout these discussions you will be

encouraged to share your perspectives on assessment according to your current role (e.g., teacher, administrator) and area of expertise (e.g., early childhood, science). Through historical and contemporary readings written by major assessment theorists we will examine key questions and issues such as:

- What is the purpose of classroom assessment? How are these purposes linked to historical and emerging theories of education?
- How do forms of assessment limit and/or expand what is taught?
- What counts as knowledge? What knowledge is of most worth? What forms of knowing are most valued? What forms of knowledge should be most valued?
- How do the geographical, political, cultural, and social contexts of our teaching affect our assessment practices?
- What are the political, social, and ideological frameworks that inform classroom assessment practices?
- How does disciplinary knowledge influence perspectives on assessment?
- How is assessment reform enacted? What are the obstacles to change? What is the role of the teacher as change agent?

Through readings, discussions, and assignments you will broaden your understanding of assessment, the issues involved in assessment development, implementation and evaluation, and clarify your own assumptions and perspectives on assessment work.

**Evaluation:**

The course evaluation will consist of:

- |                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Reading Response                 | 30% |
| 2. Issues and Contexts Presentation | 30% |
| 3. Essential Question Paper         | 40% |

**READING RESPONSES: LEADING AND REFLECTING**

In pairs you will be required to lead a class discussion on one of the following Chapters from the textbook:

- Classroom Assessment in the Context of Learning Theory and Research
- Classroom Assessment in the Context of Motivation Theory and Research
- Historical Context of Classroom Assessment Research
- Validity in Classroom Assessment: Purposes, Properties, and Principles
- Reliability in Classroom Assessment
- Fairness in Classroom Assessment
- Formative and Summative Aspects of Assessment: Theoretical and Research
- Examining Formative Feedback in the Classroom Context: New Research
- Research on Classroom Summative Assessment

As discussion leaders you will be required to complete the following:

1. Provide a one-page summary that highlights key terms/issues discussed in the chapter and that outlines their evolution.
2. Create and lead an activity that will prompt or deepen our discussion of the issues in the chapter.
3. Lead a discussion of your colleague's responses to the reading.

In the class following your presentation, you will be required to submit a 500 word reflection on your experience of preparing for and leading your class discussion. Your presentation should answer the question. "How did your experience of preparing for and leading our class discussion deepen your understanding of the topic?"

#### *Marking Criteria*

You will be assessed according to 1) the accuracy of your chapter summary, 2) the quality of your activity (connection to topic, capacity to deepen understanding and explore content, and 3) the quality of your reflection (concrete exploration of what you have learned).

#### PRESENTATION ON ASSESSMENT CONTEXT

The purpose of the presentation is to work with a group to lead the class through of an assessment issue relative to the context in which you are working (e.g. special education, aboriginal populations, English language arts). Your presentation should include the following:

- 1) A description of the context you are exploring and a discussion of your links to that context. (What is the context? What is your experience with or interest in that context?)
- 2) A description of an assessment issues germane to the context you are exploring (What are the issues that motivated your exploration?)
- 3) A discussion of 2 or 3 articles (one must be academic, others can be from newspapers, blogs, or professional journals) that explore the issue.
- 4) An exploration of one or two key terms discussed in the course and its implications for addressing the issue you are exploring.

In this presentation you are expected to **actively engage** your peers through discussions or activities. Your group will have 30 minutes for your presentation. Presentations will be scheduled from July 15 to July 16.

#### *Marking Criteria for Curriculum Presentation*

You will be assessed according to your 1) preparation and organization, 2) exploration of how context informs issue your are exploring, 3) connection to teaching experience, and 4) ability to "actively" engage your classmates in a meaningful discussion and/or activity.

#### ESSENTIAL QUESTION PAPER

At the beginning of the course you identified a number of essential questions related to assessment that you wanted to explore in this course. In a paper of

approximately 1500 words discuss your exploration of this essential question. How have our readings, presentations and discussions in class informed your exploration of that essential question? What do readings outside of those specifically required in this course (minimum of three) contribute to your exploration of these question? What emerging ideas and insights are you developing in response to that question? What implications for your work as an educator do these insights/ideas demand of you?

A draft of your paper is due on July 19. Final paper is due by midnight on July 24.

**Marking Criteria for Article Review:**

You will be assessed according to 1) your ability to articulate a focus question for your inquiry, 2) the nature and extent of your exploration of the issue, including its links to your professional context, 3) connection to course themes and readings; and 4) the quality of the writing.

**Tentative Course Schedule**

Date:	Topic	Reading
July		
3	Introduction to Assessment	Ruth Sutton: AAC Keynote
4	Frameworks for Assessment	Sheppard (2000) The role of assessment in a learning culture.
5	Historical context of Classroom Assessment	<i>Chapter 5</i>
8	Validity	<i>Chapter 7</i>
9	Reliability	<i>Chapter 8</i>
10	Fairness	<i>Chapter 9</i>
11	Presentation Preparation (No formal Class)	
12	Assessment and Learning Theory	<i>Chapter 2, Chapter 3</i>
15	<i>Assessment Issues</i>	
16	<i>Assessment Issues</i>	
17	Formative Assessment	<i>Chapter 10, Chapter 13</i>
18	Paper Drafting (No formal Class)	
19	Summative Assessment ( <i>Peer review</i> )	<i>Chapter 14</i>
22	Public Discourses of Assessment	
23	Rearticulating Assessment Practices	

**Final Letter Grades:**

The Faculty of Education has a standardized grading schedule for graduate courses. This schedule will be used for determining final grades for graduate students in this course.

**Numeric Value**

**Letter Grade**

**Grade Point**

97 - 100	A+	4.00
93 - 96	A	4.00
90 - 92	A-	3.70

87 - 89	B+	3.30
83 - 86	B	3.00
80 - 82	B-	2.70

Note: Any course with a grade of less than B- cannot be considered for credit in the M.Ed. Program.

77 - 79	C+	2.30
73 - 76	C	2.00
70 - 72	C-	1.70

67 - 69	D+	1.30
63 - 66	D	1.00
<63	F	0.00

### Additional Readings

#### Key Terms

Burger, J., & Krueger, M. (2003). A balanced approach to high-stakes achievement testing: An analysis of the literature with policy implications. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 7.

Embretson, S. (2007). Construct validity: A universal validity system of just another test evaluation procedure? *Educational Researcher*, 36, 449-455.

Garfield, J., & Ben-Zvi, D. (2009). Helping students develop statistical reasoning: Implementing a statistical reasoning learning environment. *Teaching Statistics*, 31, 72-77. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9639.2009.00363.x.

Howard, P. (2003). "Walking the talk" in assessment: Deconstructing standardized tests in the English language arts. *English Quarterly*, 35, 24-28. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/233299374?accountid=12063>.

Kane, M. (2008). Terminology, emphasis, and utility in validation. *Educational Researcher*, 37, 76-82. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X08315390.

Kane, M. (2001). Current concerns in validity theory. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 38, 319-342. DOI: 10.1111/j.1745-3984.2001.tb01130.x.

- Kelly, D., & James, W. (2010). Exploring the reliability, validity, and utility of a higher education faculty review process. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 3, 21-26. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/196352106?accountid=12063>
- Krista, R., & Philip, H. (2012). Assessing the psychometric properties of the achievement goals questionnaire across task contexts. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 35, 232-248. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1032661959?accountid=12063>.
- Li, H. (2003). The resolution of some paradoxes related to reliability and validity. *Journal Of Educational And Behavioral Statistics*, 28, 89-95.
- Linn, R. (2001). The Design and Evaluation of Educational Assessment and Accountability Systems. *CSE Technical Report*. Center for Research on Evaluations and California University.
- Lissitz, R., & Samuelson, K. (2007). A suggested change in terminology and emphasis regarding validity and education. *Educational Researcher*, 36, 437-448.
- Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth. (2006). *Rethinking classroom assessment with purpose in mind*. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth.
- Mills, G. (2010). *Action Research: A Guide For The Teacher Researcher*. (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Boston, MASS: Pearson.
- Mislevy, R. (2007). Validity by design. *Educational Researcher*, 36, 463-469.
- Mislevy, R. (2004). Can there be reliability without reliability. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 29.
- Moss, P. (2004). The meaning and consequences of "reliability". *Journal Of Educational And Behavioral Statistics*, 29, 245-250.
- Nagy, P. (2000). The three roles of assessment: Gatekeeping, accountability, and instructional diagnosis. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 25, Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/215374855?accountid=12063>.
- Reynolds, C., Livingston, R., & Wilson, V. (2008). *Measurement and Assessment in Education*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). NY: Pearson.
- Robin, K., Lori, R., & Vacha-Haase, T. (2001). A reliability generalization study of the teacher efficacy scale and related instruments. *Educational and Psychological*

*Measurement*, 61, 404-420. Retrieved from  
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/221538667?accountid=12063>

Saunders, M., Bamber, R., Trowler, P., & Bamber, V. (2011). *Reconceptualizing Evaluative Practices in Higher Education: The Practice Turn*. SRHE, Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Slomp, D., & Fuite, J. (2005). Following Phaedrus: Alternate choices in surmounting the reliability/validity dilemma. *Assessing Writing*, 9, 190-207.  
doi:10.1016/j.asw.2004.10.001

#### History:

Alkin, M. (Ed). (2004). *Evaluation Roots: Tracing Theorists' Views and Influences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Broadfoot, P., & Black, P. (2004). Redefining assessment? The first ten years of assessment in education. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 11, 7-26.

Farmer, L. (2008). A study of an attempt to improve the reliability of teachers' holistic scores of elementary writing through in-house professional development. *University of Central Florida*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, , 136-n/a. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304353721?accountid=12063>. (304353721).

Goodwin, L., & Leech, N. (2003). The meaning of validity in the new standards for educational and psychological testing: Implications for measurement courses. *Measurement & Evaluation In Counseling & Development (American Counseling Association)*, 36, 181- 191.

Klinger, D., DeLuca, C., & Miller, T. (2008). The evolving culture of large-scale assessments in Canadian education. *Canadian Journal of Education Administration*, 76.

Moss, P. (2007). Reconstructing validity. *Educational Researcher*, 36, 470-476. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X07311608

Phelps, R. (2007). *Standardized Testing*. NY: Peter Lang.

#### Critical Perspectives:

Absolum, M., & Gray, J. (2011). *Clarity In The Classroom: Using Formative Assessment For Building Learning-Focused Relationships*. Winnipeg, MA: Portage & Main Press.

- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educ Asse Eval Acc*, 21, 5-31. DOI 10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5.
- Black, P. (2007). Full marks for feedback. In: *Making the grade. Journal of the Institute of Educational Assessors*, Spring, 18-21.
- Brookhart, S. (2004). Classroom assessment: Tensions and intersections in theory and practice. *The Teachers College Record*, 106, 429-458.
- Clark, I. (2012). Formative assessment: A systematic and artistic process of instruction for supporting school and lifelong learning. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 35, 24-40. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1032662121?accountid=12063>.
- Dunn, K., & Mulvenon, S. (2009). A critical review of research on formative assessment: The limited scientific evidence of the impact of formative assessment in education. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 14, 1-11.
- Green, S., Johnson, R., Kim, D., & Pope, N. (2007). Ethics in classroom assessment practices: Issues and attitudes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 999-1011.
- Leung, C. (2007). *Dynamic assessment: Assessment for and as teaching? Language Assessment Quarterly*, 4, 257-278. DOI:10.1080/15434300701481127
- Lock, C., & Munby, H. (2000). Changing assessment practices in the classroom: A study of one teacher's challenge. *Alberta journal of educational research*, 46, 267-79.
- McMillan, J. (Ed.). (2008). *Formative Classroom Assessment: Theory Into Practice*. NY: Teachers College Columbia University.
- Nicol, D., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31, 199-218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Popham, J. (2013). *Classroom Assessment: What Teachers Need to Know*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Pearson.
- Stiggins, R., & Chappuis, J. (2011). *An Introduction to Student-Involved Assessment for Learning* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Sutton, R. (2009). Making formative assessment the way the school does business: The impact and implications of formative assessment for teachers, students and school leaders. *Springer International Handbooks of Education*, 23, 883-899.
- Taras, M. (2005). Assessment – summative and formative – some theoretical reflections. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53, 466–478.



- Volante, L., & Beckett, D. (2011). Formative assessment and the contemporary classroom: Synergies and tensions between research and practice. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 34, 239-255. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/881644001?accountid=12063>
- Volante, L. (2004). *Teaching to the test: What every educator and policy-maker should know*. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 35, <http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/volante.html>
- Webber, C., Aitken, N., Lupart, J., & Scott, S. (2009). *The Alberta Student Assessment Study: Final Report*. Government of Alberta. Alberta Education, Alberta, Canada.
- Williams, D. (2006). Measurement and assessment supporting evaluation in online settings. *Online Assessment, Measurement and Evaluation: Emerging Practices*, 316-330.
- Yorke, M. (2003). Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and the enhancement of pedagogic practice. *Higher Education*, 45, 477-501.