

Readiness Factors:

Criteria for Evaluating a District's Level of Preparedness for a Formative Assessment (FA) Pilot Study

Indicators Related to Capacity	Indicators Related to Need	Indicators Related to Experience
<p><u>Data Management</u></p> <p>Evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure and resources (financial, human) to support documentation of formative processes and effective use of FA results. • Capacity to manage longitudinal student performance data (qualitative and quantitative) securely and to efficiently monitor markers of student progress. • Communication mechanisms that support measurement model (e.g., feedback loops). • Technological capacity to support FA program goals. • Compatibility with other components of the comprehensive assessment program. 	<p><u>Function</u></p> <p>Evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and common need or purpose for FA data (e.g., supporting or individualizing instruction; measuring student progress; evaluating program or intervention effectiveness; aligning curriculum; decreasing performance gaps; diagnosing student strengths and limitations) within the comprehensive assessment program. • Consistency in describing goals for FA program or target population for FA. • Fidelity between envisioned measurement model and how results will be used. 	<p><u>Assessment History</u></p> <p>Evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current or past use of a "shelf" FA product. • Current or past use of a customized FA product or existing item pool. • Documentation of the technical quality and/or effectiveness of past or present FA programs or practices. • Application of recommendations from recent assessment review processes, feasibility or alignment studies, or needs assessments. • Experience-based appreciation for strengths—and limitations—of FA.
<p><u>Local Commitment</u></p> <p>Evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerging or existing district leadership in FA. • Teacher and administrator receptivity to using data formatively. • District policies that support and policy-makers that endorse FA initiatives. • Key stakeholder support for FA development processes. • Professional development opportunities for teachers in using assessment as an instructional tool. • History of district-level responsiveness to calls for curricular change or instructional innovation. 	<p><u>Administration Strategies</u></p> <p>Evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose-linked plan for administering FAs (pre-/post-; on-demand; interim basis). • Flexible administration options that allow for adaptation to different school structures and student populations. • Compatibility with other components of the comprehensive assessment program. 	<p><u>Standards-based Instruction</u></p> <p>Evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom teaching and learning anchored in the knowledge and skills embodied in the state standards. • Standards-based instructional materials. • Integration of instruction and assessment in district classrooms. • Students engaged in their own learning and informed about the benchmarks against which their work is judged.
<p><u>Standards</u></p> <p>Evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content and performance standards that provide a framework for curriculum and instruction by clearly articulating learning goals. • Coherent standards system that describes the scope and sequence of what students should know and be able to do but also identifies priorities for instruction and for assessment. • Content and performance standards (knowledge, skills, processes) that are conducive to finely grained learning objectives. 	<p><u>Achievement Outcomes</u></p> <p>Evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent performance expectations across all student populations. • Well-defined criteria (e.g., rubrics, achievement-level descriptors; exemplars) for target-level performance. 	<p><u>Staff Expertise</u></p> <p>Evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experienced teachers and administrators who understand the assessment process. • Instructional practices (e.g., constructivist principles, scaffolding, differentiated learning, self-assessment) reflect teacher training in cognitive development and learning theory.