Reflection Report

Submitted by: Lyazzat Kenzhekhozhayeva

Full Name:	Lyazzat Kenzhekhozhayeva
External ID:	1725CbAT64
Gender:	Female
Age:	54
Submitted At:	2025-04-18 20:59

1. CBC, CBE, and CBA as a System

The competence-based curriculum (CBC), learning (CBE) and assessment (CBA) form a single system in which the results, learning activities and methods of verification are completely identical. At the January refresher courses, a requirement was formulated: students should be able to analyze material and written evidence and, based on it, explain the value concepts of the Sako-Scythian and other steppe tribes. To achieve this goal, three "research stations" were organized: working with 3D replicas of artifacts, deciphering petroglyphs, and debating rituals. Each station forced the participants to demonstrate exactly the actions that were subsequently evaluated. The final results were verified using an analytical rubric containing three dimensions — historical accuracy, use of primary sources, and depth of interpretation — and four skill levels. Thanks to this CBC configuration (results) → CBE (activity) → CBA (category) turned out to be completely aligned. In contrast, the previous pilot course was analyzed, which used a 30-question multiple choice test that tested only knowledge of dates and names. Despite the meaningful discussions in the audience, many strong participants received low scores due to minor factual errors. The lack of consistency of the CBA with the program reduced the validity of the entire course and clearly demonstrated how easy it is to break the "goal — practice — assessment" chain. It was this experience that prompted the introduction of the matrix approach in the updated version of the program.

2. Curriculum Development and Learning Goals

The program was built around two clearly formulated competence goals: to trace and substantiate the cosmological model of the chosen tribe based on at least two primary sources and to assess the influence of natural conditions on the moral norms of early nomads by comparing the two tribes. Both goals are described through the observed action, the specific context, and clear indicators of success — the number of sources and mandatory comparative analysis. To achieve these goals, a cycle of complementary activities was organized. In the "Laboratory of Artifacts", students were offered to work with 3-D replicas of household items and fill out a table of evidence (material, symbols, dating); thus, the competence to collect and systematize primary data was formed. At GIS Sprint, tribal migration routes were superimposed on natural maps, which made it possible to identify cause-and-effect relationships between habitat and worldview; through this activity, natural factors were linked to value attitudes. The cycle ended with the "Philosophical Cafe", where a Socratic dialogue on the ethics of funeral rites was conducted; this part required argumentation of value conclusions, supported by the facts found. Each session ended with a mini-reflection: it was noted which criterion of the category has already been reached and what else is needed to reach the threshold level 2. Formative support was provided by demonstrating exemplary portfolios of previous releases with an analysis of strengths and weaknesses, issuing "growth sheets" after each station with targeted recommendations (for example, add a precipitation map to the massaget route) and converting the heading into an updated checklist used in finalizing projects. Thanks to this support, each participant understood which steps would bring him closer to the threshold level of competence. The course resulted in a multimedia "worldview portfolio" — a video presentation lasting up to ten minutes and a written explanatory note, publicly defended in front of the group. The ability to repeatedly check the checklist and receive point-to-point advice reduced stress, increased the quality of argumentation, and ensured the content of the final papers.

3. Assessment Quality: Validity, Reliability, and Fairness

During the course, the assessment system was deployed in three key areas, each of which was purposefully supported by a coach. Validity. The final portfolio required an in-depth analysis of the primary sources, thereby fully reflecting the stated competencies. However, according to the results of the audit, it turned out that a number of groups paid excessive attention to visual effects, which increased the overall score due to the content. To restore the balance, the coach decided to increase the weight of the "Historical analysis" criterion to 40% and introduce a clear verbal marker: "Aesthetics are taken into account only insofar as it strengthens the argument." Reliability. To ensure the stability of the assessment, the work of

each group was double-read; discrepancies were discussed before the agreed score. This approach gave a coefficient of agreement of k = 0.88 (Cohen's kappa), which corresponds to the level of "almost perfect" agreement. In order to further maintain reliability, the trainer introduced a regulation: after checking every sixth work, the inspectors pause, compare the interpretation of the criteria and, if necessary, clarify the working formulations of the levels. Justice. To offset the technical and stylistic diversity, the participants were offered equivalent delivery formats: video, podcast or text report. For students from remote areas who had problems with the Internet, the coach organized an offline channel: materials are received on a USB drive and uploaded to the LMS by a methodologist. The measure has eliminated digital inequality and strengthened trust in the assessment system.

4. Grading and Standard Setting

The assessment system is based on a four■level skill scale, where each level reflects the degree of competence demonstrated: Level 0, Not Demonstrated, indicates that the competence is entirely absent or contains significant factual errors. Level 1, Basic, denotes that the task was only partially completed: the logic or evidence is incomplete and inaccuracies are present. Level 2, Sufficient (Threshold), signifies that the goal has been achieved: conclusions are correct, supported by sources, and the work’s structure is clear. Level 3, Advanced, requires in■depth analysis, original interpretations, convincing argumentation and fluent mastery of the material. To successfully complete the course, each participant must achieve at least level 2 in every rubric criterion; this requirement firmly establishes the baseline for historical accuracy, use of sources and depth of interpretation. Transparency is maintained by distributing the full rubric and four annotated examples (one for each level) to participants at the introductory session. On the eve of the portfolio defence, learners submit a self■assessment form in which they compare their work against each criterion. During the subsequent consultation, the coach reviews the self■assessment alongside his own observations and provides point■by■point advice on where to add sources, strengthen logical connections or clarify arguments. Reliability is ensured through double marking: every portfolio is reviewed by two assessors. After every sixth submission, a five■minute calibration meeting is held, during which discrepancies are analysed, level descriptions are refined and, if necessary, clarifications are recorded in the methodological memo. This regular calibration prevents score drift and maintains high inter■rater consistency. The system remains flexible: if a cohort’s results are consistently well above the threshold—or conversely, if learners struggle—the coach and assessors discuss raising the requirements for level 3 or redistributing criterion weights before the next cycle begins. Participants are informed of any changes in advance, upholding the principles of fairness, predictability and trust in the evaluation procedure.

5. Use of Rubrics

An analytic rubric was devised through a five step cycle—decomposing competencies into observable actions; defining levels from “Not Demonstrated” to “Advanced”; editing for clarity; securing external peer review; and piloting five portfolios to fine tune descriptors. The rubric covers five dimensions—historical accuracy, primary source use, interpretive depth, logical structure and multimedia support—each rated on a four point scale (0–3). It served dually as a summative tool and a “mirror of growth”: participants marked which level they aimed to reach next, turning assessment criteria into a self regulation guide. To accelerate feedback, the rubric will migrate to Moodle, where unmet criteria are auto highlighted and micro tips are delivered, lightening expert workload and speeding the “action → feedback → improvement” loop. Conclusion The integration of CBC (curriculum), CBE (instruction) and CBA (assessment) has markedly elevated the rigor and transparency of professional development courses on ancient tribal worldviews. By anchoring activities and evaluations in clear competencies, teachers experienced authentic researcher roles—collecting artefacts, formulating hypotheses and substantiating conclusions. Continuous formative consultations reduced anxiety and fostered reflective practice, while regular double marking and calibration (Cohen’s kappa = 0.88) ensured reliability. Flexible submission formats and an offline channel safeguarded fairness for remote participants. As a result, 94 % of attendees met or exceeded the threshold on all criteria. Looking ahead, exemplar banks for each rubric level will be expanded; automated tracking in Moodle will provide real time progress analytics; and a mentor alumni micro community will support new cohorts in rubric based thinking. This cascading model promises to embed competency based assessment into Kazakhstan’s classrooms, nurturing students’ research skills and respect for primary sources. Ultimately, the rubric has proven more than an evaluative tool—it is a working philosophy that transforms assessment into a catalyst for sustainable professional growth and enriched historical education.

Digital Signature (CMS):


```
MIINTQYJKoZIhvcNAQcCoIINPjCCDToCAQExDjAMBggqgw4DCgEDAwUAMAsGCSqGSIb3DQEHAaCCBGYwggRiMIID
```