

---

# 2B

## Action

### *Professional Services Committee*

## **Recommended Passing Score Standard for the Revised Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) Examination**

---

**Executive Summary:** This report provides the Commission with recommendations relevant to the determination of the passing score standard for the revised RICA Written Examination and RICA Video Performance Assessment.

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission adopt the recommended passing score standard for the revised RICA Written Examination and RICA Video Performance Assessment.

**Presenters:** Yvonne Novelli, Consultant, and Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, Professional Services Division

#### **Strategic Plan Goal: 1**

#### **Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

October 2009



---

---

# **Recommended Passing Score Standard for the Revised Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) Examination**

---

---

## **Introduction**

This report describes the standard setting study for the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) Written Examination and RICA Video Performance Assessment, and provides staff-recommended initial passing standards for each examination based on the recommendations from the RICA Standard Setting Panel.

Based on the examinations development procedures discussed in the August 2009 Commission agenda item *Examinations Development Procedures and State Contracting Processes*, the revised RICA examination has progressed through the first three phases and is at the end of the fourth (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-08/2009-08-2D.pdf>). The following completed phases, as they relate to the revisions to the RICA, are discussed in the Background section of this agenda item.

Phase One: Establishing the Examination Content Expert Panel

Phase Two: Defining the Content for the Examination

Phase Three: Developing Test Questions

The procedures used in Phase Four: Setting Passing Scores of the revised RICA are detailed in the “The RICA Standard Setting Studies” section of this item. The RICA Standard Setting Panel and Commission staff-recommended passing score standards will be provided in an agenda insert to this item due to the timing of the standard-setting activities.

## **Background**

Most California-prepared elementary and special education credential candidates are required to pass the RICA in order to verify the knowledge and skills important for the provision of effective reading instruction to students, as established in Education Code Sections 44283 and 44283.2. To satisfy this requirement, Section 44283 requires that the Commission offer both the RICA Written Examination and RICA Video Performance Assessment. Candidates may use either RICA testing format to satisfy the requirement.

### Phase One: Establishing the Examination Content Expert Panel - The RICA Design Team

In 2006, the Commission initiated an advisory panel, the RICA Design Team, to align the RICA Content Specifications with the newly revised *Reading/Language Arts Framework*. The Design Team represents California teachers; reading specialists; and teacher educators with experience and expertise in the areas of reading and reading instruction, including National Board Certified teachers; reading coaches; Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) and Literacy trainers; and published reading instruction, special education, and English learner researchers.

### Phase Two: Defining the Content for the Examination - The RICA Content Specifications

The RICA Design Team members reviewed the original RICA Content Specifications and based their recommended revisions the 2007 *K-12 Reading/Language Arts Framework*, current research, comments from close to 500 public school educators and teacher educators, and their own expertise and experience in the area. A review of these specifications was also performed by the Commission's Bias Review Committee. The Commission approved the revised specifications with only minor modifications at its November 2007 meeting. An abbreviated version of the RICA Content Specifications is found in Appendix A. The approved revised specifications include the following Domains.

- Domain 1: Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment
- Domain 2: Word Analysis
- Domain 3: Fluency
- Domain 4: Vocabulary, Academic Language, and Background Knowledge
- Domain 5: Comprehension

### Phase Three: Developing Test Questions - RICA Item Development

Since then, the Design Team along with the RICA contractor, Evaluation Systems group of NCS Pearson Inc., worked to develop new and modify existing test items to reflect those specifications. Once this was accomplished and the items were reviewed by the Bias Review Committee, the proposed RICA Written Examination items were field tested by California elementary and special education credential candidates as either non-scorable test items at a regular administration or at special testing sessions arranged by deans and faculty members at Commission-approved institutions. Additionally, during field testing, credential candidates responded to the proposed RICA Video Performance Assessment testing scenarios replying to all of the prescribed assignments that an actual examinee must follow. For both examinations, the field testing confirmed the high quality of the test items and the viability of the testing formats.

### The Revised RICA Examinations

Because the RICA was revised rather than recreated, many features remain the same. The revised RICA remains competency-based with examinees evaluated based on their knowledge of the content rather than how well they perform in relation to other examinees. The original performance characteristics and scoring scales used to evaluate the constructed response items in the RICA Written Examination and the video packets in the RICA Video Performance Assessment were also retained. Also, as before, the revised RICA Written Examination will be administered six times a year and RICA Video Performance Assessment will have three submission deadlines. Beginning in July 2009, test review materials became available on the RICA website ([www.rica.nesinc.com](http://www.rica.nesinc.com)) including the RICA Content Specifications, annotated bibliography, test structure, and, for the Written Examination, a practice test.

### *RICA Written Examination*

The test structures for the revised RICA Written Examination parallel those found in the original RICA Written Examination used from 1998 until spring 2009. The RICA Written Examination is a four-hour paper-and-pencil test that consists of a multiple-choice component, focused educational problems and instructional tasks, and one case study, as described below. The first

revised RICA Written Examination administration was held on August 8, 2009, and was taken by approximately 1,000 examinees. A visual representation of the RICA Written Examination test structure is located in Appendix B.

- Of the 70 multiple-choice items, 60 apply to the examinee's score with the remaining ten non-scorable items included to collect performance data under actual testing conditions. Approximately 20% of the items assess competencies in Domain 1, 33% assess competencies in Domain 2, 10% assess competencies in Domain 3, 23% assess competencies in Domain 4, and 14% assess competencies in Domain 5.
- Each of the focused educational problems and instructional tasks represents one of the Domains 2 through 5. In each, examinees are presented with a problem or task related to a class, a group of students, an individual student, or an instructional situation and then asked to provide explanations related to appropriate instructional strategies or assessment approaches. Candidates typically provide a one-page response for each Domain 3 and Domain 4 essay item and a two-page response for each Domain 2 and Domain 5 essay item.
- The case study component incorporates knowledge from all five Domains found in the revised RICA Content Specifications. In this assignment, examinees are asked to determine the student's reading strengths and needs, describe appropriate instructional strategies, and explain these strategies' effectiveness based on substantial background information, including samples of materials illustrating the student's reading performance and various assessment results. The case study generally results in a four-page response.

To score the RICA Written Examination, the multiple-choice items are machine scored while the constructed-response items, comprised of the focused educational problems and instructional tasks and the case study, are each independently scored by two reviewers. An examinee may obtain a raw score for the multiple-choice section, which represents 50% of the test and covers the breadth of the RICA, from zero to 60. For the constructed-response section, an examinee may receive a raw score ranging from 10 to 32, based on the total of all scores from each reviewer. This score constitutes 50% of the total and is added to the multiple-choice results.

The score level to be adopted by the Commission for the revised RICA will be based on candidate results from the initial administration in August 2009. The Commission's determination of the appropriate difficulty level relevant to the "just qualified" beginning teacher will be applied to the August test results and then scaled to represent 220 in a range of 100 to 300. Future test forms will represent the difficulty level of the August 2009 form as closely as possible, with any variance applied before scaling the examinees' results on the 100 to 300 score range.

#### *RICA Video Performance Assessment*

As with the prior RICA video performance assessment, the revised RICA Video Performance Assessment that reflects the current Content Specifications requires the candidate to prepare three video packets. Each packet is to include (a) information relevant to the video-recorded reading instruction, such as information about the students and a lesson plan; (b) a ten-minute

video recording of the candidate providing reading instruction to students; and (c) a self-appraisal of the video-recorded instruction, suggestions for further or alternative instructional strategies, and similar information. The examinee demonstrates whole-class, small-group, and individual instruction, with one setting reflected in each of the video packets. One of the packets addresses Domains 1 and 2, another Domains 1 and 4, and the remaining packet Domains 1 and 5. The visual representation of the RICA Video Performance Assessment test structure is included in Appendix B. The initial submission dated for the revised RICA Video Performance Assessment will be November 13, 2009.

To score the current RICA Video Performance Assessment, two reviewers independently score each video packet, and the final *raw* score, ranging from 6 to 24, represents the total of the two independent scores for each video packet. The raw score is formulated into a scaled score, ranging from 100 to 200, with the minimum passing score of 220 representing the Commission's determination of the appropriate difficulty level relevant to the just-qualified beginning teacher.

### **The RICA Standard Setting Studies**

The purpose of the standard setting studies is to provide the Commission with recommendations, based on the informed judgments of California educators, relevant to the determination of the initial passing standards for the revised RICA Written Examination and RICA Video Performance Assessment. The educators on the Commission-established RICA Standard Setting Panel represented elementary teachers, district- and county-level educators, and teacher preparation faculty all with significant expertise and experience in the teaching of reading. The members include reading coaches; Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) and Literacy trainers; administrators; and published researchers, whose works cover reading instruction, including instruction to special education and English learner students. The names and affiliations of the members of the RICA Standard Setting Panel as well as aggregate information related to their demographics and reading instruction experience is included in Appendix C.

As with the standard setting study method used for all other Commission examinations, the process employed for both RICA examinations was consistent with recognized psychometric principles and procedures. The standard setting study for the RICA Video Performance Assessment was conducted on August 24-25, 2009. For consistency between testing formats, the same panel also performed the standard setting study for the RICA Written Examination soon after, on September 10, 2009.

#### *RICA Video Performance Assessment*

The RICA Video Performance Assessment standard setting study began with an extensive orientation and training session. Panel members were provided with a comprehensive overview of the RICA Content Specifications by one of the members, Nancy Brynelson, who was also part of the RICA Design Team and instrumental in assisting numerous reading instruction educators with implementing the revised specifications as part of her responsibilities with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

The panel was then introduced to the Video Performance Assessment testing structure and procedures, noting the registration process, three annual submission dates per specified prompts,

information and materials examinees receive before and after registering, the required contents of each video packet, and, as found in Appendix D, performance characteristics and score point descriptions for the four-point scoring scale.

This activity led to reviews of actual pre-scored video packets, ranging from a high of 4 to a low of 1, in which the members reviewed the initial portion of the written component of the packet covering the type and composition of the classroom, assessments used to determine the needs of the classroom students relevant to the proposed lesson, and the lesson plan. Then, after viewing the video of the examinee presenting the lesson, they reviewed the examinee's written self-assessment. The panel held a lively discussion regarding the rationale for the scores assigned to each video packet which helped clarify the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to obtain the various scores. The chief reader who trains the actual RICA scorers led this discussion and responded to concerns about such issues as reviewers' qualifications, various reviewer calibration procedures, and the reviewers' ability to keep extraneous issues, from spelling errors to classroom management, external from the scores assigned.

The panel members then discussed the meaning of a "just acceptable" beginning teacher which would represent an examinee who only obtained the minimum passing score. Although a number of examinees will exceed the level of acceptable knowledge and skills, none receiving a passing score should fall below this "just acceptable" level. The members applied this concept of a "just acceptable" beginning teacher along with their knowledge of what the individual scores represented to begin the following three-round standard setting process.

- Round One: Panel members were asked to independently rate three video packets, representing one-on-one, small-group, and whole-class instruction, by considering the level of response that would be achieved on each by the "just acceptable" beginning teacher. Each member's scores were totaled and disseminated to the group, and members thoroughly discussed the various points they considered to determine their score.
- Round Two: Panel members were asked to independently determine the total score that a "just acceptable" candidate would receive for all three videos. After viewing the results of this second round, members again discussed the rationale they used in determining their score.
- Round Three: Panel members were given a final opportunity to revise their independent total score.

#### *RICA Written Examination*

The September 10, 2009, standard setting meeting began with an orientation and training session. The initial step was to ask the panel members to independently take the RICA Written Examination, using the August 2009 test form, under simulated test-like conditions. This helped the members become familiar with the examination, the knowledge and skills associated with the items, and the perspective of the examinee. The panel members were then re-familiarized with the RICA Content Specifications and the concept of the "just acceptable" beginning teacher. They also reviewed the performance characteristics and scoring scales used to evaluate the constructed response items in the RICA Written Examination, which are provided in Appendix E. After this extensive training and the simulated test taking, panel members completed the following three rounds of standard setting tasks.

- Round One: The panel members were asked to individually rate each item. They were asked to rate the percent of correct responses that would be expected from “just acceptable” beginning teachers for each multiple-choice item and the level of response that would be achieved by the “just acceptable” beginning teacher for each constructed-response item. The individual total test points were distributed and members discussed the reasoning used in their determinations.
- Round Two: This round moved the panel from individual item ratings to ratings at the component level (i.e., multiple-choice component and constructed-response component). They were asked the number of multiple-choice items that would be answered correctly and the total score points that would be achieved on the constructed-response items.
- Round Three: Panel members were given the results of their Round Two ratings, along with information about the percent of examinees passing at various combinations of scores on the subtest components. They were then asked to make independent recommendations for a passing standard for each component and “component score combination rule.”

*Results of the Standard Setting Study*

Because of the Commission’s agenda publication deadline, the RICA Standard Setting Panel’s recommended passing score standard for both the RICA Video Performance Assessment and the RICA Written Examination will be presented in an agenda insert.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Abbreviated Revised RICA Content Specifications**

For the complete RICA Content Specifications, including the extensive descriptive text for each Competency, please view the RICA website at [www.rica.nesinc.com](http://www.rica.nesinc.com).

#### **DOMAIN 1—PLANNING, ORGANIZING, AND MANAGING READING INSTRUCTION BASED ON ONGOING ASSESSMENT**

Competency 1: Understand how to plan, organize, and manage standards-based reading instruction.

Competency 2: Understand the purposes of reading assessment and best practices related to standards-based entry-level assessment, monitoring of student progress, and summative assessment.

#### **DOMAIN 2—WORD ANALYSIS**

Competency 3: Understand the role of phonological and phonemic awareness in reading development and how to develop students' phonological and phonemic awareness skills.

Competency 4: Understand the role of concepts about print, letter recognition, and the alphabetic principle in reading development and how to develop students' knowledge and skills in these areas.

Competency 5: Understand important terminology and concepts involved in phonics instruction and recognize the role of phonics and sight words in reading development.

Competency 6: Understand how to develop students' phonics knowledge and skills and recognition of sight words to promote accurate word analysis that leads to automaticity in word recognition and contributes to spelling development.

Competency 7: Understand the role of syllabic and structural analysis and orthographic knowledge in reading development and how to develop students' knowledge and skills in these areas to promote accurate word analysis that leads to automaticity in word recognition and contributes to spelling development.

#### **DOMAIN 3—FLUENCY**

Competency 8: Understand the role of fluency in reading development and factors that affect students' development of fluency.

Competency 9: Understand how to promote students' fluency development.

#### **DOMAIN 4—VOCABULARY, ACADEMIC LANGUAGE, AND BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE**

Competency 10: Understand the role of vocabulary, academic language, and background knowledge in reading development and factors that affect students' development of vocabulary, academic language, and background knowledge.

Competency 11: Understand how to promote students' development of vocabulary, academic language, and background knowledge.

#### **DOMAIN 5—COMPREHENSION**

Competency 12: Understand literal, inferential, and evaluative comprehension and factors affecting reading comprehension.

Competency 13: Understand how to facilitate reading comprehension by providing instruction that prepares students for the reading task, scaffolds them as needed through the reading process, and prepares them to respond to what they have read.

Competency 14: Understand how to promote students' comprehension and analysis of narrative/literary texts and their development of literary response skills.

Competency 15: Understand how to promote students' comprehension of expository/informational texts and their development of study skills and research skills.

## APPENDIX B Revised RICA Test Structure

### Test Structure of the Revised RICA Written Examination

Content Specifications Domain	Number of Competencies*	Approximate Weighting	Approximate Number of Multiple-Choice Items	Number And Type of Constructed-Response Items	
				<i>Focused Educational Problems and Instructional Tasks</i>	<i>Case Study</i>
<b>Domain 1:</b> Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment	2	10%	10	0	1  (4-page response assessing all domains)
<b>Domain 2:</b> Word Analysis	5	33%	24	1 (2-page response)	
<b>Domain 3:</b> Fluency	2	13%	8	1 (1-page response)	
<b>Domain 4:</b> Vocabulary, Academic Language, and Background Knowledge	2	20%	15	1 (1-page response)	
<b>Domain 5:</b> Comprehension	4	23%	13	1 (2-page response)	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%**</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>

\* In the revised RICA Content Specifications, the competencies reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities related to the specific domain.

\*\* Approximate due to rounding adjustment

### Test Structure of the Revised RICA Video Performance Assessment

Content Specifications Domain	Video Packet #1: Whole-Class Instruction	Video Packet #2: Small-Class Instruction	Video Packet #3: Individual Instruction
<b>Domain 1:</b> Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment	Each video packet includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional Context Form</li> <li>• 10-minute video-recorded instruction</li> <li>• Reflection Form</li> </ul> Each video packet should demonstrate designated competencies within specific Domains of the RICA Content Specifications.		
<b>Domain 2:</b> Word Analysis			
<b>Domain 3:</b> Fluency			
<b>Domain 4:</b> Vocabulary, Academic Language, and Background Knowledge			
<b>Domain 5:</b> Comprehension			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3 Video Packets</b>		

**APPENDIX C**  
**Members of the RICA Standard Setting Panel**

Beth Andersen-Perak	Associate Professor of Reading Methods	Azusa Pacific University
Bonnie Bergerud	Elementary School Teacher, Retired, and Instructor of Reading Methods	West Contra Costa Unified School District and California State University East Bay
Jane Blomstrand	Beginning Teacher Support Assessment (BTSA) Induction and Teacher Development Coordinator	Contra Costa County Office of Education
Vallorie Borchardt	Literacy and English Language Development Coach	Madera Unified School District
Erica Bowers	Assistant Professor in the Department of Reading	California State University Fullerton
Sharla Brechbill*	Second-Third Grade Teacher, Reading Coach, Reading Instruction Facilitator, Contributing Author California Reading and Literature Project	Two Rock Union School District
Nancy Brynelson*	Co-Director of the Center for the Advancement of Reading	California State University Office of the Chancellor
Marianne Chang	Site-Based English Language Arts Instructional Coach and Intervention Teacher K-6	Lodi Unified School District
Barbara Cockerham	Assistant Professor of Education Specialization in Reading and Literacy	California Baptist University
Pamela Dunham*	District Intern Practicum Supervisor and Reading Methods Faculty	San Joaquin County Office of Education
Regina Nassiri	Literacy Coach, Sixth Grade English Teacher, and Language and Literacy Instructor	Yuba City Unified School District and Chapman University
John Shefelbine*	Reading Specialist Faculty Member and Co-Director of the Region 3 and 6 California Reading and Literature Project	California State University Sacramento
Sally Spencer	Assistant Professor in Special Education	California State University Northridge
Greta Stanton	Reading Recovery Teacher Leader	Torrance Unified School District
Sue Teele	Associate Dean and Director of Education	University of California, Riverside Extension

\* Also member of the RICA Design Team

## APPENDIX C (cont.)

### RICA Standard Setting Panels Demographic Characteristics

<b>Total Number</b>	
Participated	15
<b>Ethnicity</b>	
African American or Black	
Asian American	1
Filipino	
Southeast Asian American	
Pacific Island American	
Mexican American / Chicano	
Latin American / Other Hispanic	
Native American	
White (non-Hispanic)	14
Other	
<b>Gender</b>	
Female	14
Male	1
<b>Region</b>	
North	9
South	6
<b>Current Profession</b>	*
Public School Educator	9
College/University/District Intern Educator	10
Other	
<b>Years of K-12 Teaching Experience Related to Reading Instruction</b>	*
0-3	
4-6	1
7-10	2
11+	12
<b>Years of Teacher Education Experience Related to Reading Instruction</b>	*
0-3	1
4-6	2
7-10	6
11+	2

\* Some members have multiple current professions and experiences.

## APPENDIX D

### RICA Video Performance Assessment

#### Performance Characteristics and Score Scales for Each Video Packet

*Video Performance Assessment Performance Characteristics*

Purpose: The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains by fulfilling the purpose of the assessment

Application of Content: The candidate accurately and effectively applies the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains by planning, presenting, and analyzing a lesson that is based on one or more appropriate instructional objectives and that is appropriate in relation to the assessed needs of the students and the instructional setting (i.e., whole class, small group, or individual).

Support: The candidate supports the submission with appropriate information, explanations, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.

*Video Assessment: Four-Point Scoring Scale*

Score Point	Score Point Description
4	<p><b>The “4” submission reflects a thorough understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</b></p> <p>The submission completely fulfills the purpose of the assessment by responding fully to the given task.</p> <p>The submission provides evidence of a lesson that is based on one or more appropriate instructional objectives, is appropriate in relation to the assessed needs of the students and the instructional setting, and demonstrates an accurate and effective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission provides strong supporting information, explanations, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p>
3	<p><b>The “3” submission reflects an adequate understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</b></p> <p>The submission generally fulfills the purpose of the assessment by responding adequately to the given task.</p> <p>The submission provides evidence of a lesson that is based on one or more generally appropriate instructional objectives, is generally appropriate in relation to the assessed needs of the students and the instructional setting, and demonstrates a generally accurate and reasonably effective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission provides adequate supporting information, explanations, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p>
2	<p><b>The “2” submission reflects a limited understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</b></p> <p>The submission partially fulfills the purpose of the assessment by responding in a limited way to the given task.</p> <p>The submission provides evidence of a lesson that is based on one or more partially appropriate instructional objectives, is partially appropriate in relation to the assessed needs of the students and the instructional setting, and demonstrates a limited and generally ineffective application, which may include significant inaccuracies, of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission provides limited supporting information, explanations, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p>
1	<p><b>The “1” submission reflects little or no understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</b></p> <p>The submission fails to fulfill the purpose of the assessment by responding inadequately to the given task.</p> <p>The submission provides evidence of a lesson that is based on one or more inappropriate instructional objectives, is inappropriate in relation to the assessed needs of the students and the instructional setting, and demonstrates a largely inaccurate and/or ineffective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission provides little or no supporting information, explanations, or rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p>

**APPENDIX E**  
**RICA Written Examination**  
**Performance Characteristics and Score Scales for Constructed-Response Items**

***Written Examination Performance Characteristics***

Purpose: The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge by fulfilling the purpose of the assignment.

Application of Content: The candidate accurately and effectively applies the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge.

Support: The candidate supports the response with appropriate examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge.

***Focused Educational Problems and Instructional Tasks: Three-Point Scoring Scale***

Score Point	Score Point Description
3	<p><b>The “3” response reflects a thorough understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domain.</b></p> <p>The response completely fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding fully to the given task.</p> <p>The response demonstrates an accurate and effective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domain.</p> <p>The response provides strong supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domain.</p>
2	<p><b>The “2” response reflects an adequate understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domain.</b></p> <p>The response generally fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding adequately to the given task.</p> <p>The response demonstrates a generally accurate and reasonably effective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domain.</p> <p>The response provides adequate supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domain.</p>
1	<p><b>The “1” response reflects limited or no understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domain.</b></p> <p>The response partially fulfills or fails to fulfill the purpose of the assignment by responding in a limited way or inadequately to the given task.</p> <p>The response demonstrates a limited and/or ineffective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domain and may contain significant inaccuracies.</p> <p>The response provides limited or no supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domain.</p>

## APPENDIX E: RICA Written Examination (cont.)

### *Case Study: Four-Point Scoring Scale*

Score Point	Score Point Description
4	<p><b>The “4” response reflects a thorough understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</b></p> <p>The response completely fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding fully to the given task.</p> <p>The response demonstrates an accurate and effective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</p> <p>The response provides strong supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</p>
3	<p><b>The “3” response reflects an adequate understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</b></p> <p>The response generally fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding adequately to the given task.</p> <p>The response demonstrates a generally accurate and reasonably effective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</p> <p>The response provides adequate supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</p>
2	<p><b>The “2” response reflects a limited understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</b></p> <p>The response partially fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding in a limited way to the given task.</p> <p>The response demonstrates a limited and generally ineffective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains and may contain significant inaccuracies.</p> <p>The response provides limited supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</p>
1	<p><b>The “1” response reflects little or no understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</b></p> <p>The response fails to fulfill the purpose of the assignment by responding inadequately to the given task.</p> <p>The response demonstrates a largely inaccurate and/or ineffective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</p> <p>The response provides little or no supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the applicable RICA domains.</p>