

Brandywine School District

Assessment Inventory Report and Five Year Plan for a Balanced Assessment System



Submitted by,

Dr. Julie Schmidt

Supervisor, Assessment & Accountability

December 22, 2015

Table of Contents

Vision and Guiding Principles of a Balanced Assessment System.....	2
Process for Developing a Five-Year Plan.....	7
Survey of Educators Opinions.....	8
Recommendations General.....	8
Recommendations by Core Content Areas.....	14
Quality of Assessments.....	16
Enhancement and Monitoring of College/Career Soft Skills.....	19
Appendix A –Assessment Inventory	
Appendix B – Schedule of Meetings with Teams of Teachers and District Resource Team	
Appendix C – Teacher Survey and Results	
Appendix D – Recommendations	
Appendix E – Time Impact Audit	

Preface

When Brandywine School District began its work on Race to the Top (RttT), the first five years focused on the adoption of curriculum aligned to the Common Core Standards, providing professional development on Learning Focused Solutions, and implementing Professional Learning Communities in each school and assessment revision was strategically put on hold until curriculum changes had been established. In our second phase of our long-term plan, the District was to flesh out a comprehensive assessment system to begin the summer of 2015. However, during the RttT transition to Common Core Standards, many buildings or teams created assessments on their own without District involvement. Upon closed examination of some of these classroom assessments, it was clear that they did not necessarily align to the full breadth of the Common Core Standards, nor include various item types, such as Performance Tasks, nor measure learning beyond a Levels 1 or 2 Depth of Knowledge. These teacher-made assessments needed to be reviewed, revised, reduced or eliminated. In some cases existing assessments required restructuring. Thus, the Assessment Inventory we conducted identifies very few “district mandated” assessments “BEFORE” we launched our efforts this past summer. Concomitantly, the Inventory shows an increase in district assessments expected over the next five years as seen on the “AFTER” portion of the Inventory. To the extent possible, the increase in district assessments results from upgrades of previous classroom assessments to higher quality mandatory district assessments.

Overview of Brandywine School District’s Balanced Assessment System

In June of 2015, the Brandywine School District received a grant from the Delaware Department of Education (DDoE) to conduct an Assessment Inventory with the view to developing a Five-Year Plan for a Balanced Assessment System. The most significant component of this plan is an articulated a vision with guiding principles to frame the subsequent development of a system based on research. Generally, Balanced Assessment Systems include: Summative or annual measures of student achievement, Interim/Benchmark assessments to measure progress at certain intervals, and Formative Assessment to provide educators with feedback that is actionable. To begin the process of developing a Five-Year plan, the DDoE requires districts to

conducting an inventory of existing mandated assessments and to have teams of teachers and curriculum leaders engaged in the evaluation of those district-mandated assessments with respect to their purpose, alignment to standards, appropriateness, frequency, and possible redundancy with other assessments, particularly those required by the State.

To that end, Brandywine School District has conducted an inventory of its existing assessments and proposed changes needed to ensure the assessments are aligned, purposeful, fair, communicated to all stakeholders, and serve instructional goals (See Appendix A for the Inventory). But, in addition to the formal measures of student achievement, there is considerable evidence from the research that Balanced Assessment Systems needs to include a substantial portion of Formative assessments. The work of Rick Stiggins and Paul Black and Dylan Wiliam serve as the research basis for the framework and guiding principles for Brandywine's Plan. Finally, because Brandywine's assessments are also geared toward College and Career Readiness, we are particularly drawing upon the research from David Conley on the incorporation of "soft skills" such as motivation, perseverance, grit, a growth mindset, and ownership of learning into our Vision. The Balanced Assessment System for Brandywine, therefore, will include the expanded role of the students in the assessment process (Stiggins/Wiliam) as well as the inclusion of "soft skills" (Conley) at the secondary level.

Assessment	Purpose	Benefit
Classroom Formative	Continuous, informs practice, talks about progress	Provides opportunity for changes in instruction and student improvement
Interim/Benchmark	Periodic documentation and evidence throughout the year; predictive of summative	Periodic, identify strugglers or problem standards for teachers/programs
Summative	Accountability	Determine which standards are being met

Essential Assessment Actions that lead to a Balanced Assessment System

According to Rick Stiggins, the construction of a Balanced Assessment System rely on seven broad principles:

1. Balance the district assessment system to meet all key user needs
2. Refine achievement standards to reflect clear and appropriate expectations at all levels
3. Ensure assessment quality in all contexts to support good decision-making

4. Help learners become self-assessors by using Assessment FOR Learning strategies in the classroom
5. Build communication systems to support and report student learning
6. Motivate students with learning success
7. Provide the professional development needed to ensure assessment literacy throughout the system

Addressing the Seven Principles of an Effective Assessment System

One of the reasons that an assessment system needs to be balanced and include summative, interim, and formative assessments is the need to provide information and data back to key stakeholders. (Principle #1). Those stakeholders include teachers, parents, administrators, the community at large and students. But all these stakeholders reside at different levels in the system and require different kinds of information. Summative assessments may provide students, schools, districts, parents and the community of a sense of how well students are mastering the standards. Measuring student growth and achievement of mastery of the content standards over the course of a year culminates in a summative assessment which serves the purpose of evaluating how much learning has taken place at a particular point in time that can be used to describe a student's progress toward the standards, a school's effectiveness in raising student performance, and a District's success in identifying programmatic and professional development needs. Summative assessments also highlight the achievement gaps that have or have not been closed. The data can be used to inform school success plans as well as inform students and parents of their achievement levels. But summative assessments, by definition, occur at the end of the instructional cycle and provide a modicum of information for teachers to use to inform their classroom decision-making and practices. Even at the high school level, Finals serve an evaluative (grading) purpose more than an informative (improvement) purpose. Because of these inherent limitations, a Balanced Assessment System requires additional, periodic assessments.

There are other kinds of information needed on a timelier manner by students, teachers, and administrators that can only come from interim assessments. Formal, standards-based interim assessments, such as midterms or quarterly assessments, can provide information for teachers and students to act upon to improve or enhance student learning. Often these assessments serve as marking period grades, but can also provide evidence on what standards are or are not being met by students. The concurrent adoption of a Standards-based Reporting System in the District has the potential to provide timely formative feedback to teachers and students. Although the "feedback" often takes the form of a grade, interims can also inform the development of lessons, the need for re-teaching, or the purpose of goal setting and conferencing among students. Interims

may also enrich the conversation among teachers in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) when examining student performance against common, high quality questions or tasks. Those conversations may lead to exchanges in best practices as well as identification of effective resources and opportunities for professional growth and development.

Finally, there is the need for day-to-day kinds of feedback and learning strategies embedded in formative assessments that are critical to teachers and students. Meta-analysis of Formative assessment has demonstrated international gains of up to 1/2 standard deviation growth among students whose teachers effectively employ formative assessments. Gains of this magnitude can be equated to growing two years' worth in one year or gaining 100 points on an SAT exam (Black & Wiliam). Formative assessments include those that are administered and scored as well as ones that immediately inform instruction during the actual lesson or planning for the next day's lesson. In other words, these assessments are not administered based on a point in time in a marking period as much as they represent a natural stopping point in the instructional cycle. The purpose of "assessments *for* learning" is to gather information to inform instructional decision-making. This component is the one cited most by Stiggins and Wiliam as missing from a balanced assessment system.

Based on the results of the formative assessments, both teachers and students can be made aware of what comes next in the learning – not in the next month or marking period, but in the next few lessons. Standards, by nature, are learned incrementally and require scaffolding over time. Formative assessments can identify points along the path where students are or are not being successful. "Over time they {students} progress through ascending levels of proficiency until they reach the standard. It is the levels of the ascent that classroom assessments must reflect." (Stiggins, Assessment for Learning presentation ETS/College Board 2008, p.3). And critical to the effectiveness of students is the need to provide them with learning targets translated into student-friendly versions that are shared with students at the beginning of learning (Principle #2).

To meet these objectives, the classroom formative assessments need to be of high quality (Principle #3). High Quality Classroom Assessments meet the following criteria:

1. Purpose is clear
2. Targets are clear

3. Assessment method matches the learning target
4. Assessment represents what was taught
5. Items, scoring rubrics adhere to standards of quality
6. Assessments reviewed for bias

Assessments for Learning, however, do not end with the classroom teacher. Stiggins and Wiliam have made a compelling case based on the research that students are also ones who are constantly assessing themselves and asking such questions as: can I learn this? Am I smart enough to learn it? Is the learning worth the energy I will have to expend? Is it worth the risk that I might fail...again? (Principle #4). For students to answer these questions affirmatively, Stiggins states that students must understand what good work: examples, models, investigations, essays, projects look like from the very beginning of learning so they can self-assess. Wiliam goes as far as stating that the primary cause of student gaps is the failure to understand what the student understanding of what is expected. The self-assessment on the part of students can help them compare their current level of work with the level of mastery expected and with the right supports learn how to close the gap between the current level and mastery level. “{W}hen these principles play out as a matter of routine in classrooms, profound achievement gains result with the largest gains for low achievers.” (p. 4). If not put into practice appropriately, struggling students could easily interpret their results on an assessment as evidence of their failure leading to a sense of hopelessness (Principle #6). In order for students, especially those struggling, to feel supported, formative assessments need to adhere to certain practices:

1. Focus on attributes of student work rather than the student as a learner
2. Provide feedback that is descriptive of the work, rather than judgmental, showing the student how to do better next time
3. Are clearly understood by the student
4. Are detailed enough to be useful but not so much as to be overwhelming
5. Are timely to inform learning

Because Brandywine’s assessments are also geared toward College and Career Readiness, we are also drawing upon the research from Conley on the possession of “soft skills” such as motivation, perseverance, grit, a growth mindset, and ownership of learning. The Balanced Assessment System for Brandywine, therefore, will include the expanded role of the students in the

assessment process and the inclusion of “soft skills” at the secondary level. Thus, taken together, the work of Stiggins, Wiliam, and Conley provide the theoretical foundation upon which a balanced assessment system rests.

These components need to guide the development of the Formative Assessment development work. In order to achieve these goals, the District’s Five Year Plan will incorporate Professional Development to increase teachers and school leaders’ assessment literacy, especially classroom assessments (Principle #7). With the partnership in BRINC the District is poised to work with teams of teachers beyond district boundaries to build and share an assessment bank of items that is instructionally sensitive (Popham).

Finally, the District needs to find ways to communicate the results of all assessments with the key stakeholders. District summative assessments are shared with students and parents but could also serve as a basis for teachers to review results and undertake curricular adjustments. The District already utilizes iTracker Pro in Data Service Center to provide summative and other types of assessments such as Rtl screening and progress monitoring. The District Office is seeking various ways to make interim and formal formative assessment results rapidly available to teachers and students via Performance Plus. While in initial phases, the District Resource Team is already piloting the collection and reporting of initial interim and formative assessments. Along with the use of data repositories, the Learning Management System, Schoology, lends itself to data collection and analysis not only on the part of teachers, but also on the part of students who can manage and monitor their learning of the standards.

Process for Developing the Five-Year Plan

The initial step in the process of developing a Five-Year Plan was the analysis of the District-mandated assessments. Brandywine School District has, for the most part, not required numerous common assessments of students. (Instead the District has focused on curriculum adoption, alignment and instructional practices such as Learning Focused Solutions.) On their own, some PLCs over the years have created classroom assessments but these do not constitute “district-mandated” assessments and thus are in need of revision and district-wide implementation. Apart from traditional common midterms and Finals at the secondary level, the only other common assessments have occurred with the adoption of the Singapore Math series in elementary and the adoption of the Journeys curriculum for English Language Arts at Elementary. (See Appendix A).

Starting this past summer the District Resource team meet with teams of teachers from various core subjects and identified items that need to be changed, discarded, or adopted to align to the standards and various item types, such as performance tasks. (See Appendix B for schedule of meetings). The teachers agreed to pilot the assessments and meet to make any revisions based on student work. Much of the work involves revision of our classroom assessments in the core areas and the need to develop performance tasks and significantly expand the role of formative assessments. The work with teams of teachers will continue over the next five years.

Survey of Educators' Opinions

Through our Assessment Expert, Dr. Audrey Noble, we surveyed our teachers regarding their views on district-mandated assessments. (The survey and results appear in Appendix C.) The response rate was only 10% but did span the grade ranges from KN-12. Even though instructed to consider only District-mandated assessments, many teachers did comment on Component V required by the State.

General Recommendations

Number	Recommendation	Rationale	Authority	Timing of Recommendation
1. Restructure Elementary ELA Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt performance tasks/common assessments embedded within Units based on research of best practices. Move to marking period interim assessments. Deepen teachers' understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of CCSS. Teachers need to increase the use of formative	ELA Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan

	<p>Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by interim and summative assessments.</p>	<p>assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.</p>		
<p>2. Restructure Elementary Math Assessments and implement over a Five Year span</p>	<p>Adopt performance tasks and MC items embedded within units based on research of best practices. Move to marking period assessments. Deepen teachers' understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured</p>	<p>Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of CCSS. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring</p>	<p>Math Supervisor</p>	<p>Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan</p>

	by interim and summative assessments.	their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.		
3. Restructure Secondary ELA Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt performance tasks/common assessments embedded within Units based on research of best practices. Move to quarterly assessments redistribute mid-term questions. Deepen teachers' understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by interim and summative assessments.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of CCSS. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional	ELA Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan

		development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.		
4. Restructure Secondary Math Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt performance tasks embedded within Units based on research of best practices. Move to quarterly assessments redistribute mid-term questions. Deepen teachers' understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by interim and summative assessments.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of CCSS. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.	Math Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan

5. Restructure Secondary Science Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt performance tasks embedded within Units based on research of best practices. Move to quarterly assessments redistribute mid-term questions. Deepen teachers' understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by interim and summative assessments.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of Next Generation Science Standards. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.	Science Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan
6. Restructure Secondary Social Studies Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt performance tasks embedded within Units based on research of best practices. Move to quarterly assessments redistribute	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment	Social Studies Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan

	<p>mid-term questions. Deepen teachers' understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by interim and summative assessments.</p>	<p>item types. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.</p>		
7. Incorporate "soft skills" into existing structures	<p>Articulate and expand the development and monitoring of "soft skills" identified by David Conley into secondary practices such as SSP and Freshman Seminar</p>	<p>Conley identifies "soft skills" associated and integral to college/career readiness. These soft skills do not lend themselves to traditional assessments but need to be monitored at the building</p>	District Resource Team	<p>Plan for monitoring in 2015-16 school year and begin implementation in the 2016-17 school year. Continue to modify on annual basis</p>

		level through existing structures.		
--	--	--	--	--

Recommendations by Core Content Area

English Language Arts – The current practice of a common mid-term and Final at the secondary level reduces the opportunity for teachers to make instructional changes to lessons and for students to understand what needs to be done to reach the learning target. The Five-Year Plan will establish more frequent quarterly collections of student assessments primarily by the adoption and implementation of writing assessments – a gap that needs to be addressed and emphasis renewed. The new writing assessment data will initially be stored in Data Service Center’s iTracker Pro website for teacher access and analysis. Eventually, however, the data will be migrated to DOE’s Performance Plus site along with the data from the other core content areas. At the elementary level, revised and adopted assessments will replace existing ones and make uniform the expectations and monitoring of student progress toward the ELA Standards. For instance, the elementary assessments that accompanied the Journey’s curriculum needs to be modified in order to fully align with the Common Core Standards and expectations. Writing at the elementary level will be assessed each marking period with a summative ELA assessment in the spring for grades 1-2. The State’s Smarter tests will serve the purpose of summative assessments for grades 3-5.

Math – Singapore Math was one of the first elementary resources aligned to Common Core and was adopted by the District several years ago. At that time, the District mandated the administration of certain unit assessments. The “district-mandated” assessments at elementary consisted of multiple choice items that did not measure the full range of student learning expected by the Common Core; nor did the items align to the types that demonstrate the breadth of student knowledge and skills. In addition, the Singapore curriculum materials did not adequately address all math standards and contained some gaps that needed to be filled by other lessons. That work has been undertaken by the District Resource Team and likewise requires revised assessments that range beyond multiple choice to include constructed response and performance tasks that fully measure students’ learning of important concepts and skills. The District Resource Team is considering a spring summative in math for grade 1; there is already a summative in existence for grade 2. The District will rely on the State’s Smarter summative for grades 3-5.

At the secondary level, the District has been piloting Eureka math curriculum aligned to the Common Core. (The previously used textbook series did not include assessments that measure standards-based learning nor contain the breadth of item types needed to demonstrate master and growth.) The Five-Year Plan will provide an opportunity to modify and adopt better

assessments on a more frequent basis providing teachers with time for making instructional adjustments. In particular, the frequent formative assessments will be “instructionally sensitive” and the data will be stored in DOE’s Performance Plus site where sophisticated reporting options are available. At the high school level, midterms and Finals will be revised. The District will rely on the State’s Smarter tests for summative assessments in grades 3-8.

Science – Over the past few years, elementary science teachers have been given the option of administering the Smithsonian end of module assessment for grades K-5. Elementary science assessments were kept optional while teachers devoted their energies to mastering the new Common Core standards in ELA and Math. The anticipation of the development and adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards also put a hold on mandatory science assessments and focused attention on the Next Generation curriculum and training. Future assessment development awaits DOE’s actions in adopting/requiring performance tasks and a summative assessment in elementary science. Once the State has acted; the District can then determine the next steps.

At the secondary level, the District can continue to align their curriculum with the Next Gen expectations as well as develop a wide range of items for formative assessments and administer quarterly performance tasks. Grade 6 teams of teachers have created building-level summative exams but they are not “district mandated.” There are Finals at grades 7-12 all of which will eventually require changes to the items to align with Next Generation standards and include Performance tasks. Teams of teachers have been developing Performance Tasks for grades 6-12 to administer as part of the mid-term and this work will continue over the next Five Years. The data will eventually be placed into Performance Plus for teacher access and analysis. However, as with elementary, the extent of district development of assessments is contingent upon the State’s decisions regarding summative and performance tasks in science.

Social Studies is following a similar track awaiting decisions on the part of the State to require summative assessments and Performance tasks. The District’s Five Year Plan anticipates shared formative assessments between ELA and Social Studies at the elementary level. No interims or summative assessment, other than those required by the State, will be developed. At the secondary level, teams of teachers who have been developing their own assessments will be working to develop common performance tasks for grades 6-12 implemented during the interim mid-term with revised Finals for grades 6-12. Common unit

assessments are anticipated for grades 6-12 to function as formative assessments. Like all other content areas, these data will be housed in Performance Plus.

For Science and Social Studies, the focus of the Five-Year Plan is to replace building level assessments with district common assessments aligned to the Standards and containing the full range of assessment types, most significantly performance tasks. Finally for all core content areas, the District's membership in the BRINC consortia and the adoption of Schoology for the delivery of assessments is already opening a way for teachers to utilize classroom formative assessments and share item banks as well as other resources at both the elementary and secondary level.

Quality of Assessments:

The District is committed to following the Principles outlined in the Standards for educational and psychological testing that identify the need for high-stakes tests to be valid, reliable, fair, and students to have an opportunity to learn the material being assessed. Although the only "high stakes" assessments occur in the summative (Final) exams, the District will, to the extent possible, review each assessment with respect to its purpose, fairness, and use. For "high stakes" assessment the District will obtain data to determine the validity and reliability of our Final exams. In the meantime, the development of a balanced assessment system that consequently meets measurement standards is more likely if the items themselves are of high quality to begin with. CCSSO has published criteria to consider when developing items in ELA and Math.

ELA:

A. ASSESSING STUDENT READING AND WRITING ACHIEVEMENT IN BOTH ELA AND LITERACY:

The assessments are English language arts and literacy tests that are based on an aligned balance of literary and informational texts.

B. FOCUSING ON COMPLEXITY OF TEXTS: The assessments require appropriate levels of text complexity; they raise the bar for text complexity each year so students are ready for the demands of college- and career-level reading no later than the end of high school. Multiple forms of authentic, previously published texts are assessed, including written, audio, visual, and graphic, as technology and assessment constraints permit.

C. REQUIRING STUDENTS TO READ CLOSELY AND USE EVIDENCE FROM TEXTS: The assessments consist of reading and writing test questions, tasks, and/or prompts, as appropriate, that demand that students read carefully and deeply and use specific evidence from increasingly complex texts to obtain and defend correct responses.

D. REQUIRING A RANGE OF COGNITIVE DEMAND: The assessments require students to demonstrate a range of higher-order, analytical thinking and performance skills in reading, writing, and research based on the depth and complexity of CCR standards, allowing robust information to be gathered for students with varied levels of achievement. Assessments should have a significant portion of total score points come from items that demonstrate a deeper level of knowledge (e.g., represent the high complexity levels designated by taxonomies of cognitive demand).

E. EMPHASIZING WRITING THAT DEMONSTRATES PROFICIENCY IN THE USE OF LANGUAGE, INCLUDING VOCABULARY AND CONVENTIONS: The assessments require students to demonstrate college- and career-ready abilities in writing, vocabulary knowledge and strategies, and the use of language and its conventions.

F. ASSESSING RESEARCH AND INQUIRY: The assessments require students to demonstrate research and inquiry skills, demonstrated by the ability to find, process, synthesize, organize, and use information from sources.

G. ASSESSING SPEAKING AND LISTENING: Over time, and as assessment advances allow, the assessments measure the speaking and listening communication skills students need for college and career readiness.

Math:

H. FOCUSING STRONGLY ON THE CONTENT MOST NEEDED FOR SUCCESS IN LATER MATHEMATICS: The assessments help educators keep students on track to readiness by focusing strongly on the content most needed to pave the way for later mathematics. In a CCR aligned assessment system, the elementary grades focus strongly on arithmetic, assessing other topics such as statistics, probability, and congruence only after elementary grades; middle grades focus strongly on ratio, proportional relationships, pre-algebra, and algebra; and high school focuses on widely applicable prerequisites for careers and postsecondary education.

I. ASSESSING A BALANCE OF CONCEPTS, PROCEDURES, AND APPLICATIONS: The assessments measure conceptual understanding, fluency and procedural skill, and application of mathematics, as set out in CCR standards.

J. CONNECTING PRACTICES TO CONTENT: The assessments include brief questions and also longer questions that connect the most important mathematical content of the grade or course to mathematical practices, for example, modeling and making mathematical arguments.

K. REQUIRING A RANGE OF COGNITIVE DEMAND: The assessments require students to demonstrate a range of performance based on the depth and complexity of CCR standards, allowing robust information to be gathered for students with varied levels of achievement. Assessments include questions, tasks, and/or prompts, as appropriate, about the basic content of the grade or course as well as questions that reflect the complex challenge of CCR standards. Assessments should have a significant portion of total score points come from items that demonstrate a deeper level of knowledge (i.e., represent the high complexity levels designated by taxonomies of cognitive demand).

By constructing a balanced assessment system that includes interim and formative assessments, the District is more poised to realize other significant criteria from CCSSO, namely:

Yield valuable REPORTS ON STUDENT PROGRESS, by:

A. FOCUSING ON PROGRESS TO READINESS: Score reports illustrate a student's progress on the continuum toward college and career readiness, grade-by-grade, and course-by-course. Reports stress the most important content, skills, and processes and show how the assessment focuses on them, to show whether or not students are on track to readiness.

B. PROVIDING TIMELY DATA THAT INFORMS INSTRUCTION: Reports are instructionally valuable, are easy to understand by all audiences, and are delivered in time to provide useful, actionable data to students, parents, and teachers.

Finally, over the years, the need to craft and select items that meet principles of universal design so that the assessment itself does not impede student performance and offers appropriate accommodations and modifications where feasible.

Enhancement and Monitoring of College/ Career “Soft Skills”

The work by David Conley for more than a decade has fleshed out the key critical areas associated with college/career readiness. In particular, his identification of “soft skills” merges well with the District direction of fostering a growth mindset and strengthening student ownership of learning, motivation, and perseverance. While these traits cannot be measured on a standard test, they are ones the District is committed to including in the larger vision of a balanced assessment system. While our high school Freshman Seminar course addresses some of these soft skills, there may be opportunities to build upon the Student Success Plan (SSP) taken by 8th and 9th graders and support students through their high school years acquire these underpinnings of learning and focusing on the “whole student.” From Conley’s work on this particular component he calls: Act: Students can gain expertise through sustained application and practice of **key learning skills and techniques** when they are integrated into regular instruction on an ongoing and sustained basis. No single factor may be more important to student success than the degree to which students take ownership of their learning and are allowed to do so. At the heart of student **ownership of learning** is a complex array of intersecting skills and dispositions including the following:

- Goal setting
- Persistence
- Self-awareness
- Motivation
- Help seeking
- Progress monitoring
- Self-efficacy

In addition to assuming ownership of learning, students need a set of **techniques to succeed in challenging and demanding learning situations**. Some key techniques identified through Dr. Conley’s research include:

- Time management (AVID programs)
- Study skills (Freshman Seminar course)

- Test taking (SAT Prep course)
- Note taking (Cornell Notes strategy)
- Memorization (Core Content areas)
- Strategic reading (English)
- Collaborative learning (core Content areas)
- Technological proficiency (core content areas)

The Five Year Plan Preliminary Schedule:

School Year 2015-16: All core content areas identify and pilot at least one performance task per grade level. Teachers review results in PLCs and revise over the summer. Work with DOE to input data into Performance Plus.

School Year 2016-17: Core content areas continue to develop and pilot changes in a quarterly or interim assessments at each grade level and begin to incorporate both formative assessments and formative assessment practices*. Teachers meet with District Curriculum Supervisors to analyze results, refine items, and provide professional development to teachers to strengthen their assessment literacy. Teams of teachers begin to work on strategies to focus on the role of the students in the context of assessment.

School Year 2017-18: Core content areas pilot a third interim or quarterly assessment and are using formative assessment items within Schoology as well as adopting formative assessment practices in the classroom. Students monitor their learning goals and continue to increase their ability to monitor their learning and display evidence of the possession of “soft skills” at the high school level.

School Year 2018-19: Secondary core content areas have revised Final Exams to reflect summative achievement of the standards with a range of item types, including performance tasks. Students' acquisition of "soft skills" at the high school level is regularly incorporated into classroom assessment practices.

School Year 2019-20: All core content areas implement all components of a Balanced Assessment System.

Appendix A - Assessment Inventory

Name of Assessment	DIBELS*	Math Universal Screener*	District Mid-terms	District Finals	Mathematics	English/Language Arts	PSAT**	AP Exams**	IB Exams**
Entity Requiring Assessment	RtI Reading	RtI Math	District	District	District	District	District	<i>District</i>	<i>District</i>
Grades tested	KN -1	KN -1	9-12	9-12	2-5	2-5	10-11	10-12	10-12
Courses or Subjects tested	Reading	Math	Core Content Subjects	Core Content Subjects	Singapore Math Cumulative Test, Units 1-3	Journey's Benchmark Unit 3 Reading	English & Math	<i>(See AP Exam Schedule)</i>	<i>(See IB Exam Schedule)</i>
Students eligible or required to take assessment	All students	All students	All High School Students	All High School Students	All students	All students	All students	<i>Optional - Students enrolled in AP courses</i>	<i>Students enrolled in IB courses</i>
Type of Assessment	RtI Screener	RtI Screener	Interim	Summative	Formative	Interim	Interim	<i>Summative</i>	<i>Summative</i>
Content Standards Measured	Common Core State Standards Reading	Common Core State Standards Mathematics	State Standards in various subject areas	State Standards in various subject areas	Common Core	Common Core	College Board PSAT Standards	<i>College Board AP</i>	<i>IB Programme</i>
Intended Purpose of Assessment	Identify students in bottom quartile in need of interventions; progress monitoring of interventions	Identify students in bottom quartile in need of interventions; progress monitoring of interventions	Student evaluation of mastery of standards	Student evaluation of mastery of standards	Data to inform instruction	Data to inform instruction	Prediction of SAT performance; AP Potential; National Merit Scholarship	<i>Advanced Placement Credit</i>	<i>IB Credit</i>
Intended Use(s) of Assessment	Diagnostic - Response to Intervention to monitor and measure student progress toward the standards	Diagnostic - Response to Intervention to monitor and measure student progress toward the standards	Factor into Course Grades. Inform students, teachers, and parents of student learning of subject matter standards	Factor into Course Grades. Inform students, teachers, and parents of student learning of subject matter standards	Instructional	Instructional	Diagnostic	<i>Potentially provide students with college bearing credit</i>	<i>Potentially provide students with college bearing credit</i>
Users of the Assessment	Build RtI classes and provide interventions	Build RtI classes and provide interventions	Grading	Evaluation	Teachers	Teachers	Teachers, counselors, students	<i>Teachers, students, and colleges</i>	<i>Teachers, students, and colleges</i>
Do users of the assessment use it for its intended purpose?	Yes (Teachers, Administrators, District Staff)	Yes (Teachers, Administrators, District Staff)	Yes for grading	Yes for grading	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Degree of usefulness of assessment (1 not useful - 5 very useful)	4 - useful as a screener	4 - useful as a screener	2 - limited use to inform instruction and provide timely feedback to students	3 - but cannot provide timely feedback to students	3 - assessments need to be upgraded to align with Common Core	3 - assessments need to be upgraded to align with Common Core	5 - very useful	5 - <i>very useful</i>	5 - <i>very useful</i>
Type of Administration	Benchmark	Benchmark	Benchmark	Benchmark	Formative	Formative	Interim	<i>Summative</i>	<i>Summative</i>
Item type(s)	CR	CR	MC CR	MC CR	MC CR	MC CR	MC	<i>MC CR OE</i>	<i>MC CR OE</i>
Test administration time	3-8 minutes per student	15 minutes per student	90 minutes per subjects	90 minutes per subjects	One class period	One class period	2 hours, 45 minutes	<i>May</i>	<i>May</i>
Testing window	Fall, Winter, Spring	Fall, Winter, Spring	Mid to end of January	June 2 - 5	Winter	Winter	October	<i>(See Exam Schedule)</i>	<i>(See Exam Schedule)</i>
Test Frequency	3 times a year; progress monitoring every 6 weeks	3 times a year; progress monitoring every 6 weeks	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual	<i>Annual</i>	<i>Annual</i>
Time between test administration and results to users	Immediate	Immediate	One week	One week	One week	One week	3 months	<i>2-3 months</i>	<i>2-3 months</i>
Vendor	University of Oregon	DDOE	na	na	na	na	College Board	<i>College Board</i>	<i>IB Programme</i>
Contract Expiration date			na	na	na	na	Annual renewal	<i>June</i>	<i>June</i>
Entity that holds contract	District	State	na	na	na	na	District	<i>District</i>	<i>District</i>
Annual cost per student	\$1.00 pers tudent	Free	na	na	na	na	\$15 per student	<i>\$91 (student expense)</i>	<i>\$110 (student expense)</i>
Funding Source	District	District	District	District	District	District	District	<i>Families (DoE supports Low Income)</i>	<i>Families</i>
* Response to Intervention testing required by Federal Government							**Not included in inventory totals; however, many students do take one or more of these assessments.		

Appendix B – Schedule of Meetings with Teachers & Consultant

Science	Social Studies	Math	ELA	
07/07/15	07/27/15	10/05/15	07/08/15	
07/08/15	07/28/15	10/28/15	07/09/15	
07/27/15	10/19/15	11/02/15	07/20/15	
07/28/15	11/16/15	11/04/15	08/11/15	
08/11/15		12/07/15	09/21/15	
08/12/15	10/05/15	12/10/15	10/27/15	
09/16/15	11/02/15		10/28/15	
09/21/15	12/07/15		11/09/15	
09/30/15			12/01/15	
10/19/15			12/07/15	
11/02/15				
11/09/15				
11/16/15				
12/10/15				

District Resource Team Meetings with Consultant (Dr. Audrey Noble)

Kutch	Hawley	Riches	Wagner	Schmidt/Hohler
11/20/15	10/13/15	10/27/15	11/20/15	07/30/15
				07/13/15
				08/10/15
				11/20/15

Appendix C – Teacher Survey

Directions: The District is seeking your feedback on the various District-required assessments that are administered to your students so that we can upgrade, streamline, modify, reduce, or eliminate the amount of testing required. We would appreciate your anonymous feedback to inform this process. Please consider only District assessments when taking this survey; it is not about all the tests required by the State (DPAS Measure Bs, RtI, Smarter, DCAS, etc.) Instead, focus just on our common assessments from Journeys, Singapore, Science, Social Studies, Midterms, and Finals. The results of the survey will be compiled and reported back to the District by Dr. Audrey Noble. The results will be shared with Staff.

I. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions about (<Insert name of assessment>).

- 1) How do you use student scores from this assessment? (Check all that apply)
 - a) Understanding student achievement and/or growth to a set goal
 - b) Informing instructional practice
 - c) Predicting performance on a future assessment
 - d) Diagnosing individual student learning needs
 - e) Factoring into course grades
 - f) I don't use the results of this assessment.
 - g) Other _____
- 2) To what degree have your students had the opportunity to learn the material tested on this assessment? -
 - a) Far too little
 - b) Too little
 - c) About right
 - d) Too much
 - e) Far too much
- 3) How well do the results of this assessment align with your professional views of what your students know? -
 - a) Very poorly aligned
 - b) Poorly aligned
 - c) Fairly aligned
 - d) Well aligned
 - e) Very well aligned
- 4) Have you received training on interpreting and using the results of this assessment? -
 - a) None
 - b) Little
 - c) Some
 - d) Substantial
- 5) In regards to improving students' learning, how helpful is this assessment?
 - a) Never helpful

- b) Rarely helpful
- c) Sometimes helpful
- d) Very often helpful
- e) Always helpful

6) Would you recommend that the district continue to administer this assessment?
Yes No

7) Other Comments?

II. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions about (name of 2nd assessment).
[Same 7 questions as above]

III. My primary teaching assignment is
a) Elementary
b) Middle School
c) High School

IV. My core subject area(s): _____

Survey Results

BRANDYWINE SCHOOL DISTRICT TEACHERS' FEEDBACK ABOUT DISTRICT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

Response Rate *Participants by Level*

Level	n	%
Elementary	113	60%
Middle School	17	9%
High School	54	29%
No response	3	2%
Total participants	187	100%

In an effort to determine representativeness, the above response rates were disaggregated by content area and level. Responses are estimated¹ to represent the following percentages of the total teacher population:

Level/ Content Area	% of total
Elementary school teachers	34%
Middle school ELA teachers	30%
Middle school Mathematics teachers	21%
High school ELA teachers	39%
High school Mathematics teachers	36%

Since none of these percentages should be considered “representative” of the overall faculty, the results of this survey are presented in form of highlights which reflect the key ideas forwarded by the faculty who did participate.

¹ Population estimates of elementary school teachers are based on counts of teachers listed within the 2014-15 Delaware DOE school profiles.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' VIEWS

Elementary Language Arts Assessments² (n=38 responses)

- *To what degree have your students had the opportunity to learn the material tested on this assessment?*
 - About 2/3 indicated that the students' opportunity to learn was "about right"; the remaining 1/3 indicated that students had "too little" or "far too little" time to learn what was expected on these assessments.
- *How well do the results of this assessment align with your professional views of what your students know?*
 - The range of opinion on this question varied significantly from "very poorly" to "very well" with about half saying the assessments were "fairly aligned."
- *In regards to students' learning, how helpful is this assessment?*
 - A little more than half (21) of the teachers defined these assessments as "sometimes helpful;" only 6 saw them as "very often" or "always" helpful;" 10 described them as "rarely" or "never" helpful.
- *Would you recommend that the district continue to administer this assessment?*
 - Views in this regard were mixed: 60% responded "yes" and 40% said "no".
- *Teachers' Comments*
 - Teachers raised concerns about too much time being committed to testing overall. Not only the preparation for and the administration of the tests, but also the time that they personally commit to developing assessments- all detractors from instructional time, preparation and delivery. Also, unrealistic expectations of time allotted for instruction vs. testing related to the Journeys assessments was mentioned.
 - Concerns regarding the negative impact of these assessments on special education students (even with accommodations) were discussed.

² Most (27) respondents spoke to LA assessment at the elementary level in general. Eleven spoke directly about the Journeys assessment and DIBELS.

Elementary Mathematics Assessments³ (n=63)

- *To what degree have your students had the opportunity to learn the material tested on this assessment?*
 - About 1/3 indicated that the students' opportunity to learn was "about right"; the remaining 2/3 indicated that students had "too little" or "far too little" time to learn what was expected on these assessments.
- *How well do the results of this assessment align with your professional views of what your students know?*
 - About half of respondents said the assessments are "poorly" or "very poorly" aligned with their professional views; about half said the assessments are "fairly aligned."
- *In regards to students' learning, how helpful is this assessment?*
 - About half of the teachers defined these assessments as "sometimes helpful;" only 6 saw them as "very often" helpful;" the remaining 24 described them as "rarely" or "never" helpful.
- *Would you recommend that the district continue to administer this assessment?*
 - Views in this regard are mixed: 56% responded "yes" and 44% said "no".
- *Teachers' Comments*
 - Many teachers spoke about how there is just too much testing –"I spent 39 days giving assessments mandated by the district or the state. 39 Days!!!!"
 - They expressed concerns that there is too much instructional time "wasted" on assessment, having negative impact on instructional time and student motivation.
 - Some teachers expressed the need for better formative assessment and fewer summative tests.
 - Concerns were raised about the usefulness of tests for special needs students, wasting their time and being too difficult; also the opposite concern was shared-- about the impact of RTI on average and high performing students –"leaving (them) sit up to an hour a day"

³ These responses refer to ELEM Math, Universal Screener, Performance Plus, STAR, and Eureka assessments.

Middle School Teachers' Views

The previous section was presented according to content area based on the total number of elementary teachers who had participated in the survey. However, only 17 middle school teachers responded; therefore, this section will only highlight the key issues forwarded by this group overall.

Middle school teachers who participated represented a range of content areas and submitted feedback in regards to numerous assessments including Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, Science, CTE, Music, Common Assessments, Measure B, and Performance Tasks. Overall, similar to the elementary teachers, they complained that there are “too many assessments”

While some see the value of having “common assessments” to “ensure that teachers are keeping pace”, others said “let us use the time to teach and the students’ learning will increase.” Consequently, 70% of them recommended that the district should not continue to administer the particular assessment they were addressing.

When asked about students having an opportunity to learn what was being expected on the assessments, about half of the middle school teachers responded that the opportunity was “about right.” The remaining half said that the students had “too little” or “far too little” opportunity to learn what was being tested. Moreover, about 60% of the teachers said that the tests “poorly” or “very poorly” aligned with their professional views of what their students know.”

High School Teachers' Views

Fifty-four high school teachers responded the survey. They represented a range of content areas and submitted feedback in regards to numerous assessments including language arts, math, science, and social studies mid-terms and finals as well as ELA common assessments, World language, Measure B, Engage NY curriculum assessments, ELA pre-test, and ELA synthesis essays. Subsequently, with the low response rate, analysis according to specific assessment was not feasible. What follows is an overview of key issues derived from respondents' comments and some survey items.

Since the participation of teachers from Language Arts and Mathematics approached a reasonable participation rate, their responses regarding midterms and finals as to where they should be continued were examined. The ELA teachers tended to recommend that midterms and finals be discontinued while the mathematics teachers recommended that they remain. It is important to remember that these recommendations come from a very small number of high school teachers (ELA=7 and Mathematics =8).

One concern raised by high school teachers dealt with their students not taking many of the tests seriously due to their lack of relevance to them personally.

“The district and state common assessments, as a junior English teacher, are: Group B pre- and post-test... a synthesis essay per marking period... Smarter Balanced... SAT... Guess which test the students do not take seriously out of those three?”

“I teach mainly college-prep and co-teach a class where many of the students don't care about their scores...”

Another concern was what is perceived as the “district's jump(ing) on the latest bandwagon” resulting in poorly implemented curriculum and assessment (ex. Engage NY curriculum). Time for professional collaboration lost to assessment is a concern at this level as well.

“Can I say that this is exhausting?? We have to revamp units just to check a box. It's not at all effective practice. It's just doing something because it's required--not for the benefit of students. Sure, teachers need to push the rigor, but why not let that be driven by giving teachers time to share instead of handing them more to do?”

Appendix D – Table of Recommendations

Number	Recommendation	Rationale	Authority	Timing of Recommendation
Restructure Elementary ELA Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt Performance Tasks/common assessments embedded within units based on research of best practices. Move to quarterly assessments. Deepen teachers understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by interim and summative assessments.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of CCSS. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teacher's teachers' assessment practices.	ELA Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan

Number	Recommendation	Rationale	Authority	Timing of Recommendation
Restructure Elementary Math Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt Performance Tasks/common assessments embedded within units based on research of best practices. Move to quarterly assessments. Deepen teachers understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by formative and summative assessments.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of CCSS. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.	Math Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan

Number	Recommendation	Rationale	Authority	Timing of Recommendation
Restructure Secondary ELA Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt Performance Tasks/common assessments embedded within Units based on research of best practices. Move to quarterly assessments redistribute mid-term questions. Deepen teachers understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by interim and summative assessments.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of CCSS. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.	ELA Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan

Number	Recommendation	Rationale	Authority	Timing of Recommendation
Restructure Secondary Math Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt Performance Tasks embedded within Units based on research of best practices. Move to quarterly assessments redistribute mid-term questions. Deepen teachers understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by formative, interim and summative assessments.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of CCSS. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.	Math Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan

Number	Recommendation	Rationale	Authority	Timing of Recommendation
Adopt redesigned Elementary Science Assessments aligned to Net Generation Standards and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt State-developed revised Smithsonian end of module assessments. Deepen teachers understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by formative and summative assessments where available from the State.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of Next Generation Science Standards. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.	Science Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan. Adoptions dependent upon actions of State Department of Education.

Number	Recommendation	Rationale	Authority	Timing of Recommendation
Co-implement joint ELA/Social Studies formative assessments	Co-plan development of joint ELA/Social Studies formative assessments around Informative text. Deepen teachers understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by formative and summative assessments where available from the State.	Classroom assessments do not measure ELA and Social Studies combined Standards. Formative assessments developed in ELA can lend themselves to use in Social Studies using Non-literary resources.	Social Studies Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan. Adoptions dependent upon actions of State Department of Education.

Number	Recommendation	Rationale	Authority	Timing of Recommendation
Restructure Secondary Science Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt Performance Tasks embedded within Units based on research of best practices. Move to quarterly assessments redistribute mid-term questions. Deepen teachers understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by interim and summative assessments.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types/or measure rigor of Next Generation Science Standards. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.	Science Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan. Development of assessments dependent upon actions of the State Department of Education.

Number	Recommendation	Rationale	Authority	Timing of Recommendation
Restructure Secondary Social Studies Assessments and implement over a Five Year span	Adopt Performance Tasks embedded within Units based on research of best practices. Move to quarterly assessments redistribute mid-term questions. Deepen teachers understanding of Formative Assessments and incorporate both formal assessments and informal assessment practices. Revise or adopt new assessments that are instructionally sensitive. Ensure that teachers can identify in their lesson plans where students have an opportunity to learn the content and skills measured by interim and summative assessments.	Current Assessment does not align to current assessment item types. Teachers need to increase the use of formative assessments and feedback to improve student learning. Students need to be included in monitoring their achievement, as appropriate. Assessment literacy among staff needs to be enhanced. Professional development must be provided to strengthen and expand teachers' assessment practices.	Social Studies Supervisor	Work to begin summer of 2015 and continue through the Five Year Plan

Appendix E - Time Impact Audit

BEFORE				AFTER	End of Five Year Balanced Assessment Plan			
Grade Level	RTI* Federal Mandate (Hours per student)	District Content (Hours per student)	Total Before Recommendations (Hours per student)	Total After Inventory	RTI* Federal Mandate (Hours per student)	District Content (Hours per student)	Total After Recommendations (Hours per student)	Time Changes
K	ELA = .24 Math = .75	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	1	1	ELA = .24 Math = .75	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	6	5
1	ELA = .35 Math = .5	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	1.4	1.4	ELA = .35 Math = .5	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	7.83	6.43
2	0.33	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	0.83	0.33	0.33	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	16.5	16.17
3	0.33	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	3.33	3.33	0.33	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	15	11.67
4	0.33	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	1.83	1.83	0.33	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	15.5	13.67
5	0.33	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	1.83	1.83	0.33	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	15.5	13.67
6	1.5	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	1.5	1.5	1.5	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	16.5	15
7	1.5	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	5.5	5.5	1.5	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	16.5	11
8	1.5	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	5.5	5.5	1.5	ELA/Math/Sci/Social	16.5	11
9	1.5	Math/ELA/Science/Social Studies (Mid-terms and Finals)	14.5	14.5	1.5	Math/ELA/Science/Soci al Studies (Mid-terms and Finals)	30.5	16
10	1.5	Math/ELA/Science/Social Studies (Mid-terms and Finals)	14.5	14.5	1.5	Math/ELA/Science/Soci al Studies (Mid-terms and Finals)	30.5	16
11	na	Math/ELA/Science/Social Studies (Mid-terms and Finals)	13	13	na	Math/ELA/Science/Soci al Studies (Mid-terms and Finals)	30.5	17.5
12	na	Math/ELA/Science/Social Studies (Mid-terms and Finals)	13	13	na	Math/ELA/Science/Soci al Studies (Mid-terms and Finals)	30.5	17.5
Total	10.66		77.72	77.22	10.66		247.83	170.61
AVERAGE	0.97		5.97	5.94	0.97		19	13
* Does not include time for Progress Monitoring		Without Classroom- based Performance Tasks		* Does not include time for Progress Monitoring		With Classroom-based Performance Tasks		

NOTE: Please see Preface for rationale explaining increase in Formative (classroom-based Performance Tasks)