4.4 Uses assessment data as a basis for standards-based instruction in each domain of responsibility, meeting current learner needs and leading to next level of development, raising the academic performance level of individuals and of a group of students, over time, to a higher level. (CO: 1.1, 3.5, 5.4)

	Basic (1.0 - 1.9)	Developing (2.0 - 2.9)	Proficient (3.0 - 3.9)	Advanced (4.0)
Uses Assessment Data	No evidence that s/he modifies instruction based on analysis of student learning	Evidence of some modifications of plans/instruction to address individual student needs but these are not based on ongoing data of student learning or contextual information	Makes modifications of plans/instruction to meet individual student needs AND presents documentation that modifications are based on student learning data	Meets criteria for Proficient and includes explanations of why modifications would improve student learning
	No evidence OR does not use assessment data in any of the following ways:	Plans more than one type of change based on assessment data in more than one domain of responsibility but may not provide evidence of modifications and decisions that are sound because limited implementation of plans:	Uses assessment data to implement at least 4 of the types of changes listed below; examples include instruction in more than one domain of responsibility:	Uses assessment data to implement all of the types of changes listed below; examples include instruction in each domain of responsibility:
	a. to plan initial teaching activities (e.g., uses results of pre-tests to identify learning goals and/or teaching strategies) b. to group students for instruction (e.g., uses the results of an assessment such as a unit test or homework assignment to develop flexible groups) c. to individualize learning objectives and/or teaching stategies for groups of students who did not meet learning goals (e.g., reteaches the concept of "metaphor" and implements additional independent practice activities based on unit test on figurative language) d. to individualize learning objectives and/or teaching strategies to provide enrichment (e.g., based on pretest results, assigns an alternative assignment) e. to individualize learning objectives and/or teaching strategies for individual students (e.g., implements peer tutoring over specific concepts after a lesson assessment) f. to change teaching during lessons (based on spontaneous student responses can change approach -- e.g., questioning, giving feedback, sequencing activities, slicing back without losing focus on objective) g. to identify/plan additional assessments for students (e.g., implements a diagnostic assessment of computation skills after reviewing unit test)			
Raising Achievement	No evidence or student data are presented inaccurately, incompletely, or without clarity (reviewer cannot understand the data or their meaning)	Some student data are presented, but data may be incomplete, i.e., they do not include individual student data or summarize group	TWS group and indivdiual student data are presented accurately, completely, and with clarity (reviewer can understand the data or their meaning)	Shows consistency by meeting criteria for "Proficient" in more than unit/teaching plan
	No evidence of analysis or interpretation of student data OR interpretation is inaccurate or unsupported by data	Analysis and interpretation of student data are+C31 accurate and supported by data but does not completely and thoroughly interpret group and individual performance	Analysis and interpretation of both individual and group data are accurate, supported by data, and complete	Shows consistency by meeting criteria for "Proficient" in more than unit/teaching plan

Raising Achievement	No evidence OR none or limited improvement in learning for students who received instruction (limited = data iindicate that >20% of students showed no or limited impact of instruction)	At completion of the TWS/unit, >80% of the group of students raised their academic performance from pretest and made progress towards each learning goal	At completion of the TWS/unit, ALL individuals and 100% of the group of students raised their academic performance from pretest and made progress towards each learning goal	Repeatedly, across different learning areas, has evidence that s/he has raised academic achievement of all students, including areas of reading & writing
	No evidence OR no interventions attempted for those who do not demonstrate learning as the TWS is implemented	Some students improve, but minimal interventions attempted for those who remain unsuccessful	All students improve, and teacher documents efforts to change instruction for students who were not making progress	Shows consistency by meeting criteria for "Proficient" in more than unit/teaching plan

Operationalization/Criteria:

Guidelines for Admission to Education: *Not evaluated at admission to education*

Guidelines for Admission to Student Teaching:

1. Benchmark is that the student can *plan changes in teaching and learning activities based on assessment data.*
2. Benchmark at admission to student teaching is "Developing" on dimension 1 .

Evidence to be Evaluated: Lessons for different academic areas of responsibility, assessment plans from a unit implemented with students (mini work samples), field experience teachers' evaluations/feedback

Guidelines for Program Completion/Student Teaching:

1. Required for program completion is a rating in the "Proficient" range in all dimensions of the standard. OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE IS PROFICIENCY ON PERFORMANCE ON ROWS 3 AND 4 OF DIMENSION 2 (Raising Achievement).
2. Observe at least three administered lessons and sample lessons from the lesson plan notebook. Evaluations should include daily lessons, especially for Dimension 1f and follow-ups to more summative evaluations (e.g., unit tests, portfolio assessments); evaluate the TWS.
3. Observe assessments in each domain/teaching area (e.g., writing, reading, social studies for elementary teachers).
4. In considering IMPACT on learning, consider percent increase (including inpact on students who did well on the pretest), how impact affects grades, etc.
5. The narrative for the Inventory should specify an example of a skill/observation that led to the rating, e.g.: *As result of instruction in his TWS, he documented that the mean change in performance on the pre/post test was 62%; 100% of students improved at least 30%; no student scored below 70% on the post assessment.*

Examples of Evidence: Assessments and reflections included in lesson plans notebook, TWS, assessments in eportfolio, direct observation of lessons, interview with teacher about follow-ups to assessments

Rationale:

Borich, G.D. (2010). *Effective teaching methods: Research-based practice* , 7th ed. Upper Saddle Rivers, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Gronlund, N.E., & Waught, C.K. (2009). *Assessment of student achievement* , 9th ed. Upper Saddle Rivers, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Herbert, E.A. (2001). *The power of portfolios: What children can teach us about learning and assessment* . San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kauchak, D.O., & Eggen, P.D. (1998). *Learning and teaching: Research-based methods* , 3rd ed., Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & McTighe, J. (1993). *Assessing outcomes: Performance assessment using dimensions of learning.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

McLoughlin, J.A. (2008). *Assessing students with special needs* , 7th ed. Upper Saddle Rivers, NJ: Merrill.

Popham, W.J. *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know* , 5th ed. Upper Saddle Rivers, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Shepard, L.A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher, 29* (7), 4-14.

Stiggens, R.J. (2008). *Introduction to Student-Involved Assessment for Learning* , 5th ed. Upper Saddle Rivers, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Taylor, C.T. (1994). Assessment for the measurement of standards: The peril and promise of large scale assessment reform. *American Educational Research Journal, 31* , 231-262.

The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality: Teacher Work Sample . Available at http://www.uni.edu/itg/PDF_files/June2002promptandrubric.pdf.