

Strand 3 Pre-assessment

Focus Areas

1	Data Teams Process
2	Data Collection
3	Data Analysis
4	Response to Analysis
5	Evaluation

Participants respond with:

1	We don't do this.
2	Sometimes this happens but not always.
3	This is new for us and we are still learning how.
4	We've been doing this for a while and it is working well.
5	We've got this down. It is a regular process that we refine.

Data Teams Process

1. Data teams/PLCs (professional learning communities) meet at least monthly for a minimum of 45 minutes.
2. Teachers share student achievement results with cross-grade-level teams on an ongoing basis.
3. Cross-grade-level teams focus on what is working and what is not regarding curriculum alignment.
4. Data teams/PLCs establish goals based on analysis of data.
5. Data teams/PLCs select instructional strategies to meet goals.
6. Data teams/PLCs determine adult results indicators.
7. Data teams/PLCs determine student results indicators.
8. A team process that focuses on improving student learning is used.

Data Collection

9. Data collection includes state assessment reports.
10. Data collection includes formative assessment results.
11. Data collection includes **cause data** (teacher behaviors that engage students in learning).
12. Data collection includes **effect data** (student performance).
13. A balance of assessments is used to collect evidence to inform instruction.

14. Data results are publicly communicated throughout our school.
15. Formative assessments are embedded in instruction.
16. Classroom assessments are aligned with learning objectives.
17. Learning objectives are clearly stated in lesson plans.

Data Analysis

18. Student data are analyzed to determine areas of strength in student performance.
19. Cause data (adult behaviors) are analyzed to identify replicable practices.
20. Student data are analyzed to determine areas of weakness in student performance.
21. Cause data (adult behaviors) are analyzed to identify problematic practices or policies to address.
22. We examine cohort data to evaluate changes as students move through our school.
23. We use margin of error when interpreting group achievement results.
24. We use margin of error when interpreting student achievement results.
25. We examine multi-year data for trends among grades or groups of students.
26. We use multiple measures to triangulate evidence of trends, strengths and/or weaknesses.
27. We use multiple measures of student performance to triangulate evidence of students' learning needs.
28. Triangulation of point-in-time and improvement measures is embedded in our data analysis practices.
29. Analysis involves thoughtful collaboration around actual student performance.
30. We use OAKS reports to determine general strengths or weaknesses.
31. Formative assessments are reviewed for alignment with Oregon curriculum standards and/or Essential Skills.
32. Formative assessment score reports are reviewed prior to selection to determine usefulness of the reports for a specific purpose.
33. The technical adequacy of interim assessments is reviewed prior to selection.
34. We connect analysis of adult and student indicators.

Response to Analysis

35. Instructional decisions are based, in part, on formative assessments of prior learning.
36. Instructional decisions are based, in part, on embedded assessments during instruction.
37. Strategies are prioritized to reflect research-based strategies that will have the greatest impact.
38. Instructional changes are hypothesis-tested via action research.
39. Action research is used to verify hunches/hypotheses developed from analysis.

Evaluation

40. The data teams/PLCs process includes a description of change in student performance expected if the strategy is having the desired impact.
41. As changes are made, we collect data on student achievement that helps evaluate the impact of these changes.
42. Action research practices demonstrate the connection between cause and effect data.
43. Action research practices include pre/post assessments.