

ESSA Test Administration Monitoring Self-Assessment Rubric

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) Assessment Team created the ESSA Test Administration Monitoring Self-Assessment Rubric to offer meaningful and constructive feedback to districts participating in the ESSA Test Administration Monitoring Cycle. Its primary purpose is to honor and support the continuous improvement efforts embedded in the self-assessment process, guiding districts as they reflect on their practices and identify areas for growth.

This rubric evaluates the clarity, depth, and actionable insights in long-answer responses from the ESSA Test Administration Monitoring Self-Assessment. It allows districts to provide detailed narratives about their processes, practices, and challenges. While not all self-assessment questions are included, the rubric focuses on those requiring in-depth responses to ensure feedback is targeted and impactful. To enhance the evaluation, the ODE Assessment Team will also review responses to the Likert scale questions, one in the training section and the other in the test administration section. These questions enable districts to self-assess and indicate their current position in their journey, offering quantitative data that complements the qualitative insights from the long-answer responses.

By combining qualitative and quantitative data, the ODE Assessment Team aims to provide comprehensive, actionable feedback that helps districts refine test administration practices, improve training, and uphold compliance with state and federal guidelines. This process is rooted in a commitment to continuous improvement and ensuring equitable opportunities for all students.

Important Notes:

- All DTCs, including those serving ESDs, are required to complete self-assessment reflections that cover the schools within their geographic boundaries. This also includes any state-sponsored charter schools in their region, as well as district- or ESD-run educational programs they are contracted for managing, training, and administering statewide assessments (e.g., life skills classrooms, online education programs, and juvenile detention (JDEP), youth corrections (YCEP), or long-term care and treatment (LTCT) programs, among others).
- A district's placement within this rubric will not affect their fulfillment of federal requirement for test administration monitoring. The rubric exists solely to provide constructive feedback, supporting districts in their ongoing efforts to improve and strengthen their assessment practices. For more information regarding the process, refer to [ESSA Test Administration Monitoring Resources Guide](#).

Training

Clarity and Detail of Training Processes for STCs, TAs, QAs, and Other Personnel (Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7):

- **Extending Implementation:** Provides a thorough and clear description of the training processes for all specified personnel, addressing the following:
 - **All Assessments:** Includes details on training for general and extended ELA, Math, Science, ELPA, and the SEED Survey.
 - **Remote Administration:** Includes guidance or policies for remote administration, if applicable.
 - **Specific Steps:** Clearly outlines the step-by-step process for training each role (STC, TAs, QAs, Non-TA Personnel).
 - **Required Materials:** Lists and explains all materials, modules, and resources provided.
 - **Accessibility:** Lists training that focuses on OSAS Accessibility features for distinct roles.
 - **Timelines:** Provides clear and realistic timelines for each training, including deadlines and follow-up sessions.
 - **Roles Involved:** Identifies and explains the responsibilities of DTCs, STC, TAs, QAs, Non-TA Personnel, and students.
 - **Tailored and Structured:** Demonstrates that training is well-organized and tailored to meet the needs of each role.
- **Progressing Implementation:** Describes the training processes with reasonable clarity and detail, but one or more required elements is incomplete or omitted. For example:
 - Some roles (e.g., STCs, TAs, or QAs) are addressed in detail, while others are less clear.
 - Steps, materials, timelines, or roles involved are described but lack depth or logical flow.
 - Training appears adequate but may not fully address the unique needs of each role or district-specific policies.
- **Developing Implementation:** Provides a general overview of the training processes but lacks sufficient detail or clarity. Key components are missing or unclear, such as:
 - Specific steps for each role.
 - Training materials or timelines.
 - Tailoring to meet the needs of specific roles.
 - District-specific details for all assessments, remote administration, or OSAS-related responsibilities.
- **Beginning Implementation:** Provides minimal or vague details about the training processes, with major aspects omitted:
 - Fails to address most roles or responsibilities.

- Steps, materials, and timelines are unclear or absent.
- Training appears unstructured or generic, with little relevance to district-specific needs.

STC/TA/QA Training Successes (Q9):

- **Extending Implementation:** Provides specific methods for collecting and using feedback to improve future training sessions (e.g., face-to-face sessions, online modules). Includes straightforward evidence that training meets state and federal guidelines, including ESSA requirements. Offers details on post-training resources, support sessions, or additional modules available to reinforce learning. Also provides clear examples of tailored training specific to OSAS and role responsibilities.
- **Progressing Implementation:** Provides a clear reflection on what went well, with some examples or evidence of success (e.g., participant feedback, improved outcomes). Discusses the role of training materials or facilitators but does not fully explore their impact. Covers some key areas of the training process but may lack depth or omit notable improvements compared to previous years.
- **Developing Implementation:** Mentions general successes but lacks specific examples or straightforward evidence of success. Reflection on training materials, facilitators, or improvements may be vague or generalized. Some relevant areas of the training process may be missing or underexplored.
- **Beginning Implementation:** Provides minimal or unclear reflection on what went well in training. Lacks specificity, clear examples, or focus on the impact of training materials, facilitators, or improvements. Does not address key aspects of the training process.

Improvements Made to Training (Q10):

- **Extending Implementation:** Clearly identifies specific improvements made to STC/TA/QA training for this year, based on feedback or lessons learned from past years. Provides detailed examples of changes made (e.g., new training materials, updated instructional methods, additional support resources, modified timelines). Explains how these changes addressed specific issues from previous years and enhanced the effectiveness of training. Includes evidence or measurable outcomes showing the effectiveness of these changes (e.g., participant feedback, improved training results, or more efficient processes). Demonstrates a reflective and thoughtful approach, considering both strengths and areas for further improvement.
- **Progressing Implementation:** Identifies improvements made to training, providing some examples (e.g., changes in materials, structure, or delivery). The explanation of how these changes address past challenges may lack full depth or clarity, but it is clear they were intended

to improve training. Mentions the effectiveness of the changes, though without compelling evidence or measurable outcomes. Demonstrates some reflection but might not fully explain how the changes improved training overall.

- **Developing Implementation:** Mentions some improvements but lacks specific examples or clear detail about how they were implemented. The explanation does not fully clarify how these improvements address issues from past years or the overall impact on training. Provides limited insight into the effectiveness of the changes, and the connection to past training challenges is weak or unclear.
- **Beginning Implementation:** Provides a vague or unclear response with little to no examples of improvements made to the training. Lacks concrete details about how the improvements were implemented or their impact on training outcomes. Demonstrates little or no reflective insight into the improvements or how they were intended to enhance training compared to past years.

Potential Areas for Improvement (Q11):

- **Extending Implementation:** Clearly identifies specific areas for potential improvement in future STC/TA/QA training based on past experiences. Provides detailed examples of changes that could be made (e.g., refining training content, enhancing delivery methods, adding resources or support). Demonstrates a reflective and thoughtful approach by explaining why these changes are needed and how they would address challenges from previous years. Considers multiple perspectives (e.g., feedback from participants, challenges faced, lessons learned) and suggests targeted improvements that would significantly enhance training effectiveness. Suggests clear, actionable improvements with a strong understanding of how they will impact the training experience moving forward.
- **Progressing Implementation:** Identifies several potential areas for improvement, offering examples of changes that could enhance training (e.g., adjusting timelines, modifying materials). Provides some explanation of why these improvements are necessary, though the reasoning may lack full clarity or depth. Reflects on past challenges and proposes reasonable changes but may not fully explore the impact or effectiveness of these changes. Demonstrates some thoughtfulness, but the response may not cover all relevant aspects of the training process or provide a detailed roadmap for improvement.
- **Developing Implementation:** Mentions a few areas for improvement but lacks specificity or concrete examples of changes that could be implemented. The explanation is vague or unclear, with limited discussion of why these improvements are needed or how they would address past challenges. Shows minimal reflection on the training process and the potential effectiveness of the proposed improvements. The response lacks depth and does not provide a clear or detailed plan for enhancing training in future years.

- **Beginning Implementation:** Provides little or no information on potential improvements, with a vague or unclear response. Lacks specific examples of changes or improvements that could be made. Does not provide meaningful reflection or insight into why these changes are necessary or how they would impact future training. The response is underdeveloped and does not offer clear ideas or actionable suggestions for improvement.

Additional Training Information (Q12)¹

- **Extending Implementation:** Provides comprehensive and valuable additional information, offering elaborations on training strategies, resources, challenges, or successes that were not covered in previous responses. Adds depth and clarity to understanding the training process.
- **Progressing Implementation:** Provides relevant additional information, elaborating on aspects of the training process that were not covered earlier, but may lack some depth or detail.
- **Developing Implementation:** Provides some additional information, but it lacks focus or clarity and does not add significant value to the understanding of the training process.
- **Beginning Implementation:** Provides minimal or unclear additional information that does not contribute to a deeper understanding of the training process.

Test Administration

Clarity and Detail of Monitoring In-Person Processes (Q13):

- **Extending Implementation:** Provides a clear, thorough, and comprehensive explanation of the monitoring processes for test administration, with a focus on ensuring standardized access for all students, including the proper use of accessibility features. Includes specific examples of how the district ensures standardized access (e.g., specific steps taken to ensure accessibility, how accommodations are implemented for students with IEPs or 504 plans). Clearly describes the process for identifying and reporting potential test improprieties or irregularities, providing a detailed, step-by-step overview of how these issues are communicated and resolved.

¹ This criterion corresponds to an optional self-assessment question in the training section. It is included to provide meaningful feedback for districts that choose to answer this non-required question and elaborate further on their practices.

Demonstrates a strong understanding of the importance of accessibility and standardized testing conditions, addressing both the procedural and compliance aspects in detail.

- **Progressing Implementation:** Describes the monitoring processes clearly, addressing standardized access and reporting of irregularities, but may lack specific examples or detailed explanations of how accessibility features are implemented or how irregularities are handled. Includes a reasonable explanation of how the district ensures testing is standardized and accessible for students, though it may not be fully detailed. Addresses both the monitoring process and reporting but may leave out minor aspects of the accessibility features or steps for handling irregularities.
- **Developing Implementation:** Mentions the general monitoring processes but lacks specific detail or examples, making the explanation unclear or incomplete. Focuses on standardized access, but the explanation of accessibility features or reporting processes may be vague or insufficient. May mention some elements of the process but lacks clarity on how these processes are carried out, particularly in terms of ensuring standardized access or reporting irregularities.
- **Beginning Implementation:** Provides minimal or unclear information about the monitoring processes, with little or no mention of standardized access, accessibility features, or reporting procedures. The response lacks depth, detail, or clarity in explaining how the district ensures tests are administered in a standardized way or how irregularities are handled. Fails to clearly describe any systems in place for monitoring or reporting irregularities, providing no actionable insights or examples.

Clarity and Detail of Monitoring Remote Test Administration Processes (Q14):

- **Extending Implementation:** Clear roles and responsibilities of personnel involved (e.g., test coordinators, technology staff, etc.). Detailed procedures for ensuring consistency and accessibility in remote test administration, including how accommodations (e.g., for students with IEPs or 504 plans) are implemented remotely. Well-defined systems for identifying, documenting, and reporting irregularities or technical issues, with clear steps for escalation or resolution. Specific examples of how these systems are applied, with evidence of successful implementation or improvements made in remote testing processes.
- **Progressing Implementation:** Describes the remote test administration monitoring processes with sufficient detail, addressing key aspects like consistency, accessibility, and reporting. Mentions roles and procedures but may lack specific examples or depth in areas such as how remote accommodations are handled or how irregularities are addressed. Provides a general understanding of the systems in place but may leave out minor details or not fully explain how these processes ensure consistency and accessibility across all students.

- **Developing Implementation:** Mentions remote test administration monitoring but lacks sufficient detail or clarity about the processes, accessibility considerations, or reporting systems. Provides limited information on roles or specific procedures and may not fully explain how the district ensures consistency or accessibility in a remote setting. Fails to address key elements, such as how test irregularities are identified or managed, or lacks examples of the monitoring system in action.
- **Beginning Implementation:** Provides a vague or unclear response with minimal information about remote test administration monitoring. Does not describe clear systems in place for monitoring remote test administration or offer significant detail on how consistency, accessibility, or reporting of irregularities are maintained. Fails to clarify any processes or roles or does not mention reporting methods or how irregularities are handled.

Reflection on Test Improprieties and Irregularities (Q16):

- **Extending Implementation:** Provides a thorough, insightful analysis of the test improprieties and irregularities reported by the district, clearly identifying key themes and patterns. Demonstrates a deep understanding of the issues, offering actionable recommendations for future training or monitoring efforts based on identified trends. Explains how the district can use the reported improprieties (including those from ODE's compiled information) to inform and enhance future training or monitoring processes. Shows a reflective and thoughtful approach that considers long-term improvements.
- **Progressing Implementation:** Offers a clear reflection on test improprieties and irregularities, identifying some key themes with reasonable analysis. Provides recommendations for future training or monitoring that are relevant but may lack some depth or clarity in terms of practical application. Reflects on the reported data and offers a general understanding of how these trends can influence future training or monitoring efforts.
- **Developing Implementation:** Reflects on test improprieties and irregularities but lacks a clear identification of key themes or patterns. The analysis is general and lacks depth, with limited insights into how the identified issues can be addressed through future training or monitoring. Recommendations may be vague or not fully connected to specific data trends.
- **Beginning Implementation:** Provides minimal or unclear reflection on the test improprieties and irregularities, without identifying clear themes or patterns. Lacks actionable insights or recommendations on how to address these issues in the future. The response does not offer an analysis or connection to the data or to how it can inform future actions.

Additional Information on Test Administration (Q17)²:

- **Extending Implementation:** Provides comprehensive and valuable additional information regarding test administration, offering clear elaborations or clarifications that enhance the understanding of current practices. Adds depth to the evaluation of test administration efforts.
- **Progressing Implementation:** Provides relevant additional information, offering some elaboration or clarification on test administration. The response may lack clarity but contributes to the overall understanding of practices.
- **Developing Implementation:** Provides some additional information, but it lacks focus or clarity and does not add significant value to the understanding of test administration.
- **Beginning Implementation:** Provides minimal or unclear additional information, contributing little to a deeper understanding of test administration processes.

² This criterion corresponds to an optional self-assessment question in the test administration section. It is included to provide meaningful feedback for districts that choose to answer this non-required question and elaborate further on their practices.