

**iPAL Workshop Summary**  
**November 11-12, 2019**  
**Boston College**

**Task Development**

- It might be useful to create multiple questions/prompts that align with each scenario. Each question would tap into a particular facet of the critical thinking construct.
- Trustworthiness and relevance should always be included in each assessment of critical thinking. Otherwise, the test might not actually be assessing critical thinking.
- The iPAL framework could provide an example of how to parse out components of critical thinking.
- Each task could be further segmented into “scenes.” These scenes would represent segments of the larger iPAL task that could be administered in a shorter time frame than the entire task.

**Multiple Choice Items**

- Multiple choice (MC) items might be incorporated into the assessment to increase reliability.
- These items might capture facets of critical thinking not already captured in the written assessment.
- When presented before the written component, the MC items might scaffold (or prime) students’ responses.

**Scoring**

- The current sample scoring rubric shared with the group (based on work from Dr. Braun’s spring 2019 Issues in Testing course) includes four scoring dimensions: Relevance of Sources; Trustworthiness of Sources; Extracting Reasoning; and Integration and Communication.
- Additional scoring dimensions should be added to the rubric including perspective taking and reflecting on the consequences of selecting one course of action over another.
- One generic rubric should be developed, but then the rubrics will be modified to include additional task-specific detail. These task-specific modifications would provide guidance to raters regarding what “counts” as evidence of performance in a particular category.

**Project Management**

- The group would like to create a repository (potentially a website) for all the iPAL assessments, including an abstract describing each assessment.
- ResearchGate should also be updated with more recent iPAL information.
- The group agreed to share all currently available iPAL tasks with other iPAL members. The status of each task would be flagged as under revision, finished, etc.
- The group is not currently ready to share the tasks with the public.
- There is currently an iPAL drop-box available from Dr. Shavelson.
  - All iPAL tasks should be stored in this drop-box.
  - The group would like separate folders for each assessment and another folder for official publications.
  - Old documents should be moved to an “Archives” folder.

### **Marketing**

- We discussed what features of the iPAL assessments are preferable to the CLA, including iPAL's lower cost, task quality, strong research base, flexibility to modify for varying contexts, and development by a team of cross-cultural researchers.
- iPAL could potentially increase the visibility of the project through collaborations with IEA, TALIS, and ETS.
- We discussed a potential joint validity study between ETS and iPAL.

### **Funding**

- The group agreed that iPAL members would be responsible for seeking individual sources of funding by seeking grants through programs available through government entities, institutional funding sources, and foundations (e.g., Spencer).

### **Future Developments**

- Germany is developing short tasks (20-30 minutes) for students from multiple academic fields including teaching, medicine, and law.
  - These tasks will be administered on 8 occasions during the practical phase of students' educational program.
  - The validation studies will take place in Germany and Russia and include eye tracking, intelligence tasks, and cognitive labs.
- Computer-based scoring is under-development in Germany.
- The Columbia team would like to schedule a virtual meeting in December to share their scoring system.