



Formative Student Growth Consortium Assessment Rubric 3.2

TO: NWESD Student Growth PLC

FROM: Dr. Larry Nyland, Facilitator

DATE: July, 2014

RE: Assessment Rubric 3.2

In our work this year, we quickly realized that we had at least two parts to our work. First was basic compliance around the state required student growth goals and measures. Second was the need for a coherent assessment system that was aligned to the common core and frequent review for noticing and closing gaps.

Rubric 1.0 was a compilation of many rubrics from some of our good source documents. Rubric 2.0 was an attempt to meld those together around several (10) key themes. Rubric 3.2 (below) is more of a synthesis, based on the interviews in our PLC districts as well as five exemplar districts: Arlington, Nooksack, Everett, Tahoma, Monroe. Case stories are provided for each of the exemplar districts. Each has promising practices where they are moving toward stronger assessment systems.

Rubric 3.2 is heavily influenced by two books: **Leverage Leadership** and **Driven by Data**. These two books are compelling because they have used their rubric to leverage and replicate change in multiple schools over relatively short periods of time. They emphasize the “ripple effect” that good assessments have on good instruction. See attachment – Ripple Effect: Kim Marshall.

Driven by Data, an incredible resource – shows a ripple effect when good assessments:

- Are aligned to common core in content, rigor and format
- Given to teachers at the start of each six week window
- Used in lesson planning and in-the-moment spot checking
- Given every six weeks ... with an assessment window and calendar
- Results are reported out in user friendly item analysis within 24-48 hours
- Analyzed in depth by PLCs within one week
- Result in specific action plans for filling gaps
- Results focused discussions with principals/teachers

Rubric 3.2

What is your theory of action regarding Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction?

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| No theory of action. Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction treated separately. | Working on aligning one or two of these areas to the common core. | Common assessments are emerging but not aligned, reported out and used for improved instruction. | Common assessments aligned to curriculum. Data collected, used immediately to inform teaching and classroom observations. |
|---|---|--|---|

What summative / universal screeners do you use for student placement?

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Random assessments; not well aligned with curriculum, standards. | Universal screeners at some grades and some core areas. | Universal screeners at all grades and core areas. | Universal screeners aligned to common core. |
|--|---|---|---|

What diagnostic assessments do you use?

| | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Have only screeners; no diagnostic tests. | Some diagnostics at some grades. | Diagnostics for every grade in literacy and numeracy. | Diagnostic results inform teaching strategies and intensive interventions. |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|

What interim assessments do you use?

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Some commercial assessments at some grades. | Common, rigorous assessments given at every grade. | Transparent; teachers use as pre-tests and design lessons around interim assessments. | Time scheduled for teams to analyze; action plans are required to close gaps. |
|---|--|---|---|

Frequency of assessments?

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Given once a year as a universal screener. | Given twice a year; beginning and end. | Given 3-4 times per year. | Given 5-6 times per year. |
|--|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|

Rigor. How are you thinking about modifications for the Common Core?

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Have not yet looked at alignment. | Are developing performance tasks that mirror common core. | Have developed common formative assessments that mirror common core. | Have common formative assessments that target known gaps and look like common core format. |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|

Teacher Ownership: How are teachers engaged in assessments?

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| We have an assessment calendar that is loosely followed. | We have assessment windows that are followed regularly | Teachers know in advance which assessments are given, why, and when. | Teachers review the assessments at the beginning of the unit/term, see previous results, and discuss strategies. |
|--|--|--|--|

What PD do you provide to teachers? Assessment literacy for formative spot checking?

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Minimum expectations for giving required district tests. | Directions for writing their own student growth measures. | Backward planning from rigorous common unit assessments. | Learning to use formative/spot assessments to diagnose and close gaps. |
|--|---|--|--|

Scoring ... Reporting ... Turnaround time ... item analysis?

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Scores are turned in eventually to the district to insure that the tests were given. | Raw scores are reported out in readily accessible web-based format within 2 weeks. | User friendly one page reports are provided within one week. | User friendly item analysis reports are provided within 48 hours. |
|--|--|--|---|

Time / Expectation for review of the assessments and development of reteach action plans?

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| PLCs meet 4-5 times per year to look at data. | PLCs have a detailed protocol to review assessments quarterly. | PLCs review assessments quarterly and make action plans to close gaps. | PLCs meet at least weekly to make action plans and discuss formative unit/weekly/daily assessments. |
|---|--|--|---|

What are teachers using for TPEP "student growth measures"? Forms? Handbooks?

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| SGMs are developed by each teacher individually around district criteria. | SGMs are developed collectively around common assessments. | SGMs are developed collectively around common assessments and school and district goals. | SGMs are developed collectively around common assessments, school/district goals, and known gaps. |
|---|--|--|---|

Results focused discussions: Supervisor/Principals and Principal/Teachers?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Principals receive and review and score growth goals without conversations. | Principals get explanations from teachers about their SG goals and measures and then score. | Principals do their best, in the moment, to understand scores and ask thoughtful questions. | Principals review data in advance and prepare questions for an in-depth results based conversation with teachers. |
|---|---|---|---|

How are you reviewing / analyzing / revising “student growth process?”

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Each principal reviews and scores goals independently. | Principals bring sample goals to be scored collectively so we create some uniformity. | We score goals collectively and use that information to develop anchor samples. | We score goals collectively, create anchors and use that information to provide improved PD for the next cohort. |
|--|---|---|--|

District supervision schedule and questions for principals?

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Supervisors accept principal scoring without much review or comment. | Supervisors review sample SG goals and measures with principals and ask them to explain. | Supervisors review annual goals and meet once at the start of the year to review scores and goals for the coming year. | Supervisors review common assessments in depth by building, teacher, standard and item; meet quarterly with principals to review and ask probing questions. |
|--|--|--|---|