Dimensions of Engagement
Definitions and Ways To Incorporate

Engagement is strongly related to student performance on assessment tasks, especially for students who have been typically less advantaged in school settings (e.g. English Language Learners, students of historically marginalized backgrounds) (Arbuthnot, 2011; Darling-Hammond et al., 2008; Walkington, 2013). In the traditional assessment paradigm, however, engagement has not been a goal of testing, and concerns about equity have focused on issues of bias and accessibility. A common tactic to avoid bias has been to create highly decontextualized items. Unfortunately, this has come at the cost of decreasing students' opportunities to *create meaning* in the task as well as their motivation to *cognitively invest* in the task, thereby undermining students' opportunities to adequately demonstrate their knowledge and skills. This document defines dimensions of engagement from the literature and offers ways for item writers to incorporate them into assessment tasks. ***These engagement dimensions specifically aim help item writers by designing performance tasks that are engaging to all students, of diverse socioeconomic, cultural, and language backgrounds.***

Engagement Dimension	Definition	Ways to incorporate into the performance task with examples	Questions to consider	Appended Perf Tasks as Exs
Relevance	Relevance refers to a motivational condition wherein the student is impelled to action because s/he perceives that the task will satisfy personal needs, motives, or values (Keller, 1983). Relevance answers the question why does the educational content *matter* to the student and provides the student with a reason for doing a task.	Relevance may be fostered by **making a connection to students' lived experiences, interests, or prior knowledge**. These connections create a **"need to know"** for students and gives them a reason for doing the task. For example, a grade 11 math performance task called Speeding Tickets asks students to judge the "fairness" of a state's system for assigning speeding fines to drivers. Students must assess and compare two states' penalty systems in order to propose a fairer speeding fine system. Sixteen year olds (i.e., typically aged students in grade 11) find this task engaging because the problem setting **connects directly to their lived experiences**. These students are just beginning to drive cars and may ultimately have to deal with the financial consequences of speeding. In addition, the problem setting connects with teenagers' developmental needs for independence and fairness. A less relevant task might simply present a table of numbers and require the students to plot the function of a line on a graph. This type of task does not create a "need to know" for students because it does not make a connection to students' lived experiences and interests. Tasks that are not connected to students' lived experiences, interests or prior knowledge can be made relevant in the following ways: 1) **Personalize the task scenario or context** to the student. Instead of creating a task scenario involving two characters named Mary and Jim, personalize the task context	Why would the task matter to the student? How is the task connected to students' lived experiences, interests, or prior knowledge? What background knowledge is assumed in the task? How does the task activate students' prior knowledge?	Gr 11, math, Speeding Tickets Gr 11, ELA, Nuclear Power

| | | by placing the student in the scenario (e.g., you and two of your friends are building a skateboard ramp; you are asked to help keep your community safe). The personalization creates a meaningful context for the student and increases task relevance.

2) **Build background knowledge** associated with the task context. For example, incorporating context-dependent information into a classroom interaction activity or the task setting itself will build students' background knowledge. In a grade 11 ELA performance task called Nuclear Power, students' prior knowledge of nuclear power is elicited through charts and photos and shared via a class discussion in order to contextualize students' understanding that many societies use nuclear power to produce electricity and that its use is controversial. This background knowledge is then used to launch the central mission of this task, which is for students to research nuclear power and develop a reasoned argument (and subsequent report) for supporting or opposing the building of a nuclear power plant in the state. Without taking the time to build students' background knowledge of nuclear power, students' connection to the content would be more tenuous and the task would be less relevant for them. | | |
| Authenticity | Authenticity refers to the extent to which the task requires students to solve real-world problems that has value beyond the school (Lombardi, 2007). Real-world problems reflect tasks that are encountered in real professions and everyday settings, and are often complex and require sustained effort to solve. And the criterion of value beyond school means that the creation of products and performances has personal, utilitarian, or social significance beyond documenting the competence | Authenticity may be fostered by **emphasizing real-world connections**. This would require students to address a problem, issue, or concept that is similar to one they have encountered or are likely to encounter, in life beyond the classroom. As an example, a grade 4 math performance task called School Garden employs an authentic problem setting to engage students in the task – the students must help the principal create a garden for the school. This task emphasizes real-world connections by requiring students to problem solve the number of bulbs that will best fit in a defined area and as well as the design of the planter box in the designated space. In contrast, the same skills could be set in a less authentic math task by focusing on the procedural aspects of the task and having students simply compute mathematical equations.

In addition, authenticity may be fostered by providing opportunities for students to demonstrate **original applications of knowledge and skills**. For example, a grade | How does the task emphasize real-world connections?

How is the task structured so that students demonstrate novel applications of knowledge and skills?

In what ways does the task provide an audience for the final product beyond the classroom? | 1) Gr 4, math, School Garden
2) Gr 11, math, Speeding Tickets
3) Gr 11, ELA, Nuclear Power |

	of the student.	11 math performance task, "Speeding Tickets," asks students to apply their math skills of plotting points on a graph and creating functional linear equations from the data in order to make a reasoned judgment about which state's system for assigning speeding fines is more fair to drivers. By requiring students to analyze data, create graphical representations of the data, and interpret the data in order to solve the problem of choosing a fair penalty system, students' knowledge and skills are demonstrated in ways that reflect the ways knowledge is used in real life. That is, the task authentically represents a problem one would encounter in the real world. Finally, authenticity may also be fostered by ensuring that the completed task engenders meaning to the student beyond the score earned on the task. That is, the completed task is something the learner values because it requires the student to communicate their knowledge to **an audience beyond the teacher, classroom, and school**. In an assessment setting, providing an audience outside of the school can be accomplished **through simulations or creating a plausible scenario wherein the students assume the role of an actor** in a particular scenario. For example, a grade 11 ELA performance task on nuclear power asks students to take on the role of chief-of-staff for a local congresswoman in the U.S. House of Representatives. As the chief-of-staff, the students must research the pros and cons about nuclear power and then make a reasoned recommendation for the position that the congresswoman should take about whether or not a nuclear power plant should be built in the state. Through this role of the chief-of-staff, the report that is written showcases the student's knowledge of nuclear power and provides an audience for the constructed knowledge beyond the school. Consider a variety of audiences that may engage a diversity of learners – students of various socioeconomic, language, and cultural backgrounds. The key here is the **plausible scenario**. Care should be taken to make sure the scenario is age and developmentally appropriate for students. Requiring third grade students to assume the role of a chief-of-staff for a local congresswoman is not plausible scenario and therefore would not lend authenticity to the task. As another example, a grade 6 ELA performance task called Garden of Learning uses a plausible scenario to		

		foster authenticity to the task. Students are told that they will research and then write an article for their school newsletter on whether or not the school should start a student gardening program. However, the audience for the article is stated to be the teachers and students in the school. This task's authenticity could be improved by stating that the audience for the students' articles will be parents, school board members, and community members in order to promote value beyond the school.		
Agency	Agency refers to the extent to which one is able to choose or self-initiate an action (Deci & Ryan, 1987). Student agency may be supported by providing students with latitude and decision making opportunities that include cognitive and procedural choices.	To foster student agency, provide students with **opportunities to make decisions or choices** that are consistent with their personal goals and interests. For example, a grade 11 ELA performance task on nuclear power encourages choice within the task by having students research the pros and cons of nuclear power and then allowing them to choose the side that resonates with their own personal views to write a report that argues in favor of building or not building a nuclear power plant in their town. In addition, tasks that require students to **justify and explain their answers or compare and contrast competing ideas** promote agency. As an example, a grade 6 math performance task called Field Trip requires students to analyze a class's votes for a field trip destination and then make a judgment about where to go based on the students' choices and the cost per student. As part of the task, students must read and interpret a table containing the students' votes and make a recommendation for where to go. This task allows for multiple solutions since the students could make their recommendations based on total 1st place votes or combined 1st and 2nd place votes or a weighted total of votes. This freedom of action provides students with the agency to choose the factors from the data that they feel are important and then use that reasoning to justify their answers. In contrast, the same task would have diminished agency if the students had been instructed to determine the destination of the field trip based on the greatest amount of 1st place votes. As much as possible, structure opportunities that allow students to make **decisions or choices about handling and manipulating the instructional materials and ideas**. For	How is the task structured to allow students to make choices consistent with their goals and interests? How is the task structured to provide a range of possible solutions? How does the task require students to justify and explain their answers? How are students afforded opportunities to handle and manipulate instructional materials and ideas in the task?	1) Gr 4, math, School Garden 2) Gr 11, math, Speeding Tickets 3) Gr 11, ELA, Nuclear Power Gr 6, ELA, Garden of Learning

		example, in a grade 8 math performance task called Heartbeats, students are asked to evaluate two established equations for calculating maximum heart rates. The task provides agency by allowing students to choose whether to support their answers by creating a chart or a graph. As another example, a grade 4 ELA performance task called Animal Defenses asks students to explain in writing how the armadillo and the hedgehog's defenses are similar or different. However, the task could provide more agency to students by giving them a choice between writing their explanations or creating a Venn diagram to depict the similarities and differences between the two animals' defenses.		

Higher Order Thinking Skills	Higher order thinking skills require students to analyze, interpret, and/or manipulate information, and go beyond routine mental work, such as simple recall or retrieval of prior knowledge. For example, tasks that focus on higher order thinking skills require students to craft a persuasive essay about a current social issue (e.g. nuclear power usage, teen curfews, driving restrictions, etc.) by evaluating competing viewpoints and using evidence to support their argument (Darling-Hammond et al.,1995).	Require students to **analyze and interpret information beyond simple recall**. (Note: Tasks requiring higher order thinking skills should still be challenging, grade appropriate, and accessible to all students, especially students who are English Language Learners.) For example, a 6th grade ELA performance task asks students to write an argumentative article for their school newsletter to advocate for or against creating a school garden. Students are provided three stimuli (not summaries or simplified synopses) that they must grapple with considering the author and his/her perspective, intended audience, credibility, reliability, etc. to form an argument. 1) Article "Growing Our Own School Lunch" by Jeannine Pao, from *Appleseeds* Magazine. 2) Article "Make Your Own Dirt" by Hallie Warshaw with Jake Miller, from Get Out! Outdoor Activities Kids Can Enjoy Anywhere (Except Indoors). 3) Video "Community Gardens: Typical Costs" video by Kansas Healthy Yards and Communities. The task engages students' higher order thinking skills by offering students the opportunity to interpret, analyze information to create a compelling argument. Students employ their **higher order thinking skills** to argue for or against a school garden using the provided stimuli to support their argument. The stimuli formats are also varied as two are articles and one is a video. Varied stimuli, such as those presented to students in the Grade 11 ELA "Nuclear Power" task include a Google search result page, data charts, and pictures, also offer challenging tasks to students.	To what degree does the task involve students in manipulating information and ideas to arrive at conclusions that solve an open-ended problem? How is the task structured to provide a range of acceptable right answers that can be analytically scored?	Grade 6 ELA Garden of Learning Grade 11 ELA Nuclear Power

| Collaboration | Collaboration refers to students working with each other in pairs or small groups to share ideas, ask questions, and build on each other's ideas. Collaborative group work can increase student engagement and motivation (Johnson & Johnson, 1987; Slavin, 1990), and it provides opportunities for student talk, found to improve student learning (Yackel, Cobb, & Wood, 1991; Helmes & Clarke, 2001). Student collaboration has also been found to increase student performance in testing settings (Skidmore & Aagaard, 2004). | Include collaborative activities (in pairs or small groups) where students talk to each other to become familiar with the context of the problem, make sense of concepts, and ask questions during the Classroom Activity.

Explicitly telling students to "talk with a neighbor" about a posed in a Classroom Activity is a very feasible means of incorporating collaboration in the Classroom Activity. For example, the classroom activity may instruct the teacher facilitator to say, "What do you think we mean by a 'community garden'? Talk with your neighbor for two minutes." The instruction to "talk with a neighbor" or in small groups should be explicit, rather than simply posing questions to the class and calling on students to respond. The Classroom Activity may alternate between whole class discussion and partner/small group discussion. Also consider providing language supports such as pictures, visuals, pictures, demonstrations, and/pr realia to jumpstart partner or small group conversations.

[Classroom activity should be facilitated by students' regular classroom teacher, with the students' regularly assigned class (not with a new group of students or in a large amphitheater setting) in order to increase familiarity with the context of the task, reduce anxiety, and enhance students' sense of belonging.]

Create **task scenarios** that situate the student in a plot where s/he collaborates with another student, a family member, a coach, etc.

Although most assessments do not currently use **online or technology-enhanced collaboration**, future assessments most likely will. For example, future versions of the PISA will employ an avatar for students to collaborate with online. | ·   Are students explicitly instructed to engage with peers (e.g. "talk with a neighbor") and ask questions of their teacher in the Classroom Activity?

·   Does the Classroom Activity use these collaborative opportunities to make the task more interesting and familiar to students? | Grade 4 Math Community Garden |
| Self Assessment | Student self assessment can enhance cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement particularly for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (Munns & Woodward, 2006). Self | Current testing technologies and methods may not allow for feedback DURING an exam. However, students may benefit from self assessment throughout exam administration. For example, assessments can offer reflection questions to students such as, " What did you find out about your problem solving skills and strategies while doing this activity?" | What guidelines, checkpoints, reminders, or pop-up responses are in the task that provide students opportunities to self assess DURING their work on the performance | |

assessment refers to students reflecting on their own thinking, answers, and explanations.

Self assessment is considered feedback students give to him or herself. Feedback has been found to improve student achievement, (and should be specific about the qualities of the work, provide advice to improve the work, and avoid comparison with other students.) Productive feedback assumes that the task expectations and ways to be successful in the task are clearly communicated to the student (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Providing exemplars has also been shown to improve student engagement and achievement (Boud, et al., 1999).

Additionally, computer-testing technology may have the capability to provide "auto-feedback," to students. For example, a **pop-up response** to may alert a student that the answer is not in the expected format, similar to online forms and surveys, where the form alerts the user, "This should be a numerical response," or, "This should be a response in words."

Assessments may also provide r**eminders to students to monitor their thinking** such as those used in the Fair Go project (Munns & Woodward, 2006).
- How could you broaden your thinking through and learn more about what you did today/during a task/lesson/unit?
- Connect this knowledge to something you already know or can do.

Where possible, assessments should provide auto-feedback (i.e. clues to the causes of difficulties as well as opportunities for attacking the task in a new, more informed way -- assessment as learning).

Most importantly, tasks should **allow students to go back and revise their answers** as they progress through the collection of prompts. Doing so reinforces the notion that students are learning while doing, and therefore should be allowed to correct their answers in response to what they are discovering through the task. These reminders should be clear and accessible to all students.

task?

What other guidelines might help students check to see that they are "on the right track"?

Are the expectations of the task clear?

Are expectations for receiving "high marks" on a task clear? Providing exemplars has been shown to improve student engagement and achievement (Boud, et al., 1999).

Arbuthnot, K. (2011). *Filling in the Blanks: Understanding Standardized Testing and the Black-White Achievement Gap.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*, 139–148.

Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Sampson, J. (1999). Peer learning and assessment.*Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *24*(4), 413-426.

Darling-Hammond, L., Ancess, J., & Falk, B. (1995). *Authentic assessment in action: Studies of schools and students at work*. Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., Barron, B., Pearson, D. P., et al. (2008). P*owerful Learning: What We Know About Teaching for Understanding,* pp. 74-76. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 1024-1037.

Helme, S., & Clarke, D. (2001). Identifying cognitive engagement in the mathematics classroom. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, *13*(2), 133-153.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1987). *Learning Together and Alone: Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Learning* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Keller, J. M. (1983). Motivational design of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional-design theories and models: An overview of their current status* (pp, 383-434). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lombardi, M. M. (2007). *Authentic learning for the 21st century: An overview*. Educause Learning Initiative. Retrieved on October 15, 2014, from https://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/eli3009.pdf

Munns, G., & Woodward, H. (2006). Student engagement and student self-assessment: The REAL framework. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *13*(2), 193-213.

Skidmore, R. L., & Aagaard, L. (2004). The Relationship between Testing Condition and Student Test Scores. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *31*(4), 304-313.

Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Walkington, C. A. (2013). Using adaptive learning technologies to personalize instruction to student interests: The impact of relevant contexts on performance and learning outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*(4), 932-945.

Yackel, E., Cobb, P., & Wood, T. L. (1991). Small-group interactions as a source of learning opportunities in second-grade mathematics. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, *22*, 390-408. doi: 10.2307/749187

Task Development Guidelines with Engagement Considerations for Item Writers

Engagement is strongly related to student performance on assessment tasks, especially for students who have been typically less advantaged in school settings (e.g. English Language Learners, students of historically marginalized backgrounds) (Arbuthnot, 2011; Darling-Hammond et al., 2008; Walkington, 2013). In the traditional assessment paradigm, however, engagement has not been a goal of testing, and concerns about equity have focused on issues of bias and accessibility. A common tactic to avoid bias has been to create highly decontextualized items. Unfortunately, this has come at the cost of decreasing students' opportunities to *create meaning* in the task as well as their motivation to *cognitively invest* in the task, thereby undermining students' opportunities to adequately demonstrate their knowledge and skills. These task development guidelines offer ways to incorporate engagement considerations to performance tasks (and their associated classroom activities and aligned rubrics) to support students' ability to create meaning and cognitively invest in the task. ***These guidelines specifically aim to help item writers by designing performance tasks that are engaging to all students, of diverse socioeconomic, cultural, and language backgrounds.***

It may not be feasible for the performance task you design to include all the dimensions. However, paying careful attention to the ways in which student engagement is fostered in a task is likely to affect how students approach and complete the task. A task like Nuclear Power for example, incorporates Agency, Authenticity, and Higher Order Thinking Skills, but it may not meet the bar of Relevance for all students. Yet, by providing students with opportunities for Agency, Authenticity, and Higher Order Thinking Skills, the task becomes one that students would find more engaging. (Refer to "Engagement Features Review Tool Annotation for Nuclear Power Performance Task.") ***Engaging tasks generally incorporate at least 3 of these engagement dimensions and MUST include both task features.***

Engagement Dimensions/ Task Features (TF)	Ways to incorporate engagement features into performance tasks *for all students of diverse socioeconomic, cultural, and language backgrounds*.	Yes	No
1. **Clear Purpose (TF)**: Is the task coherent and clearly stated upfront? (rather than waiting for the culminating prompt to state the overall task purpose)	· The purpose of the performance task is **clear** to the student from its introduction.		
	· AND it is clear that each of the **items are intended to help students complete the overarching task**. (The performance task should have one overarching task, rather than an assortment of items with a common theme, say a variety of math items associated only by a theme or setting.)		
2. **Relevance**: Answers the question why does the educational content *matter* to the student and provides the student with a reason for doing the task. (**Question the relevance** of the	· **Connect** the task/topic/context to students' **lived experiences, interests, or prior knowledge**.	Yes	No
	· OR identify the **prior knowledge, familiarity, or experience** that is expected, implied, assumed, and/or required of the task.		
	· OR **personalize** the task context to the student.		

			Yes	No
task if the context is largely known primarily to upper-income students because then it would not be a meaningful context that *all* students can relate to.)	· OR explicate **background knowledge with definitions of key terms** associated with the context by activating students' prior knowledge or building background knowledge through the Classroom Activity or in the task itself. This background knowledge should include introduction to and definition of key terms, especially for students who may be English Language Learners.			
3. Authenticity: Requires students to solve real-world problems that have value beyond school.	· Emphasize **real-world connections.**		Yes	No
	· OR provide opportunities for students to demonstrate **original applications of knowledge** and skills used in the real world.			
	· OR incorporate a **variety of information sources and stimuli** that are representative of artifacts used in the world beyond the classroom.			
	· OR provide opportunities for students to communicate their knowledge to an **audience beyond the teacher, classroom, and school** by incorporating simulations or plausible scenarios in which the students assume a **role of an actor**. The task should explicitly state what is expected of students (e.g. "write a letter to your mother explaining which is the best product and include three reasons with evidence.") Care should be taken to ensure that the role and scenario are age and developmentally appropriate for students.			
4. Agency: Invites students to choose or self-initiate an action.	· Provide students with opportunities to **make procedural decisions and choices** such as handling and manipulating instructional materials and ideas.		Yes	No
	· OR require students to **justify and explain their answers** or compare and contrast competing ideas in order to provide **cognitive choices** in the task such as choosing which side of an argument they wish to argue for/against.			
5. Higher Order Thinking Skills: Requires students to employ their higher order thinking skills rather than simple recall.	· Invite students to engage with challenging tasks that ask students to **analyze and interpret information beyond simple recall**.		Yes	No
	· OR offer students the opportunity to interpret, analyze information represented in **multiple formats**.			

	· OR invite students to employ their higher order thinking skills to **argue for or against an issue, question, or stance.**		
	· OR provide students the **opportunity to grapple with complex information to choose which side of an issue they would like to argue for**.		
	· OR require students to **justify and explain** their answers or compare and contrast competing ideas.		
	· OR invite students to **demonstrate their understanding in multiple ways**.		
6. Clear Expectations (TF): Are the expectations for their work product described with an explanation for how to do well?	· The task describes **what is expected of students' work products**, specifying the audience and format of work product. (e.g., "Write a letter to your school principal with your recommendation.")	Yes	No
	· OR the task describes **how students will be evaluated**.		
	· OR the task describes to students **how to do well**. For example, the task may describe a high-scoring or exemplary work product to communicate clear expectations.		
7. **Collaboration:** Invites students to work together in pairs or small groups to share ideas, ask questions, and build on each other's ideas	· Explicitly instruct students to **"talk with a neighbor"** in the Classroom Activity.	Yes	No
	· OR explicitly instruct students to **discuss in their small groups** (and provide a structure for such group interaction, e.g. with roles) in the Classroom Activity.		
	· OR uses the **task scenario** to situate the student in a plot where s/he collaborates with another student, a family member, a coach, etc.		
	· OR incorporate the use of **technology** to allow students to conduct collaborative work online.		

8. **Self Assessment**: Permits students to monitor and evaluate their work prior to submission	· Remind students throughout the performance task to **check their work** and to make sure that all items of the performance task work together.	Yes	No
	· OR incorporate ways for students to check for **reasonableness**.		
	· OR computer-testing technology may have the capability to provide **"auto-feedback,"** to students. For example if the answer should be in numeric form and the student enters letters, a pop up can inform students of the incorrect format of the response.		
	· OR permit students **review and revise their answers** as they progress through the task components.		
9. (After completing the checklist consider this question) **Overarching Engagement Question**: Asks *why* would a student find this task engaging?	The task must be one that students would want to do. By incorporating various task features outlined in this tool, the task should be able to answer to the question, **"Why would a student (of various backgrounds) find this task engaging?"** The task must also be age appropriate and accessible to the diversity of students who will be completing the performance task.		

References

Arbuthnot, K. (2011). *Filling in the Blanks: Understanding Standardized Testing and the Black-White Achievement Gap.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Darling-Hammond, L., Barron, B., Pearson, D. P., et al. (2008). P*owerful Learning: What We Know About Teaching for Understanding,* pp. 74-76*.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walkington, C. A. (2013). Using adaptive learning technologies to personalize instruction to student interests: The impact of relevant contexts on performance and learning outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*(4), 932-945.

Review Tool with Engagement Considerations for Item Reviewers/Evaluators

This review tool is designed for reviewers/evaluators to review tasks (and classroom activities with aligned rubrics) in order to ensure that they are *created with engagement in mind for all students, of diverse socioeconomic, cultural, and language backgrounds*.

Engaging tasks incorporate **at least three of the engagement dimensions**, with a rating of at least two or higher, and **must include both task features**. [Rating scale: 0/Not At All – 1/Minimally – 2/Fair – 3 Well]

Engagement Dimensions/ Task Features (TF)	Ways to incorporate engagement features into performance tasks *for all students of diverse socioeconomic, cultural, and language backgrounds*.	Score (0 to 3)
1. Clear Purpose (TF): Is the task coherent and clearly stated upfront? (rather than waiting for the culminating prompt to state the overall task purpose)	· The purpose of the performance task is **clear to the student** from its introduction?	
	· AND it is clear that **each of the items are intended to help students complete the overarching task**. (The performance task should have one overarching task, rather than an assortment of items with a common theme, say a variety of math items associated only by a theme or setting.)	
Evidence for Score and/or Suggested Modifications:		
2. Relevance: Answers the question why does the educational content *matter* to the student and provides the student with a reason for doing the task. (**Question the relevance** of the	· **Connect** the task/topic/context to students' **lived experiences, interests, or prior knowledge**.	Score (0 to 3)
	· OR identify the **prior knowledge, familiarity, or experience** that is expected, implied, assumed, and/or required of the task.	
	· OR **personalize** the task context to the student.	

task if the context is largely known primarily to upper-income students because then it would not be a meaningful context that *all* students can relate to.)	· OR explicate **background knowledge with definitions of key terms** associated with the context by activating students' prior knowledge or building background knowledge through the Classroom Activity or in the task itself. This background knowledge should include introduction to and definition of key terms, especially for students who may be English Language Learners.	
Evidence for Score and/or Suggested Modifications:		
3. **Authenticity**: Requires students to solve real-world problems that have value beyond school.	· Emphasize **real-world connections.**	**Score (0 to 3)**
	· OR provide opportunities for students to demonstrate **original applications of knowledge** and skills used in the real world.	
	· OR incorporate a **variety of information sources and stimuli** that are representative of artifacts used in the world beyond the classroom.	
	· OR provide opportunities for students to communicate their knowledge to an **audience beyond the teacher, classroom, and school** by incorporating simulations or plausible scenarios in which the students assume a **role of an actor**. The task should explicitly state what is expected of students (e.g. "write a letter to your mother explaining which is the best product and include three reasons with evidence.") Care should be taken to ensure that the role and scenario are age and developmentally appropriate for students.	

Evidence for Score and/or Suggested Modifications:		
4. Agency: Invites students to choose or self-initiate an action.	· Provide students with opportunities to **make procedural decisions and choices** such as handling and manipulating instructional materials and ideas.	**Score (0 to 3)**
	· OR require students to **justify and explain their answers** or compare and contrast competing ideas in order to provide **cognitive choices** in the task such as choosing which side of an argument they wish to argue for/against.	
Evidence for Score and/or Suggested Modifications:		
5. Higher Order Thinking Skills: Requires students to employ their higher order thinking skills rather than simple recall.	· Invite students to engage with challenging tasks that ask students to **analyze and interpret information beyond simple recall**.	**Score (0 to 3)**
	· OR offer students the opportunity to interpret, analyze information represented in **multiple formats**.	

	· OR invite students to employ their higher order thinking skills to **argue for or against an issue, question, or stance.**	
	· OR provide students the **opportunity to grapple with complex information to choose which side of an issue they would like to argue for**.	
	· OR require students to **justify and explain** their answers or compare and contrast competing ideas.	
	· OR invite students to **demonstrate their understanding in multiple ways**.	
Evidence for Score and/or Suggested Modifications:		
6. Clear Expectations (TF): Are the expectations for their work product described with an explanation for how to do well?	· The task describes **what is expected of students' work products**, specifying the audience and format of work product. (e.g., "Write a letter to your school principal with your recommendation.")	**Score (0 to 3)**
	· OR the task describes **how students will be evaluated**.	
	· OR the task describes to students **how to do well**. For example, the task may describe a high-scoring or exemplary work product to communicate clear expectations.	

Evidence for Score and/or Suggested Modifications:		
7. Collaboration: Invites students to work together in pairs or small groups to share ideas, ask questions, and build on each other's ideas	· Explicitly instruct students to **"talk with a neighbor"** in the Classroom Activity.	**Score (0 to 3)**
	· OR explicitly instruct students to **discuss in their small groups** (and provide a structure for such group interaction, e.g. with roles) in the Classroom Activity.	
	· OR uses the **task scenarios** to situate the student in a plot where s/he collaborates with another student, a family member, a coach, etc.	
	· OR incorporate the use of **technology** to allow students to conduct collaborative work online.	
Evidence for Score and/or Suggested Modifications:		
8. Self Assessment: Permits	· Remind students throughout the performance task to **check their work** and to make sure that all items of the performance task work together.	**Score (0 to 3)**

students to monitor and evaluate their work prior to submission	• OR incorporate ways for students to check for **reasonableness**.	
	· OR computer-testing technology may have the capability to provide **"auto-feedback,"** to students. For example if the answer should be in numeric form and the student enters letters, a pop up can inform students of the incorrect format of the response.	
	· OR permit students **review and revise their answers** as they progress through the task components.	
Evidence for Score and/or Suggested Modifications:		

9. (After completing the checklist consider this question) **Overarching Engagement Question**: Asks *why* would a student find this task engaging?	The task must be one that students would want to do. By incorporating various task features outlined in this tool, the task should be able to answer to the question, **"Why would a student (of various backgrounds) find this task engaging?"** The task must also be age appropriate and accessible to the diversity of students who will be completing the performance task. ***Overall Review Comments with reference to evidence cited in rows above:***	**Overall Rating**: Reject Revise Accept