

District Report

Results of Assessment Review and Action Plan

Prepared by: Barb Driscoll, Greta Gregory, Cory Pecorella, and Kimberly Moore

Submitted to: Dr. Karen Geelan

1. What artifacts were reviewed during the assessment review process?

1. Samplings of K-12 Interim and Summative Assessments
2. A K-5 teacher-generated ELA assessment report
3. Samplings from each grade level's (K-5) lesson plans for 2013-2014
4. Student logs of three weeks that noted the subject area, the number of tests, and the format of the test (multiple choice, true/false, essay)
5. Teacher Interviews
6. K-12 Staff Survey (72 responses)

A total of 196 artifacts had been collected.

2. What did the analysis reveal? (capture summarizing statements in a well-crafted paragraph or two)

We began this charge by creating an anchor that would remind us of our priorities based on who we are as a district and what our underlying workshop goals should be based on our district's vision, mission, and core beliefs.

We created an anchor that portrayed the nurturing, safe, and rigorous learning environment depicted in a student moving upwards on a staircase. This anchor represented lifelong learning that is a part of our district's mission.

As part of our entry plan, we then decided what our entry points would be before deciding on our artifact collection and process. The Teaching is the Core Grant required us to examine our assessments based on Alignment and Validity; Impact on Instruction; Diversification and Balance; and Reliability. Our district's core beliefs include learning as the result of active engagement in relevant, purposeful activities; therefore, we wanted to study the quantity of assessments, the purpose of those assessments, and the relevance to learning that are either missing or captured in our students' assessments

Our examination of almost 200 artifacts revealed that teachers' perceptions support our plan. We know that there has been an attempt to deliver staff development within our schools regarding assessments. The professional development surveys and the interviews with teachers and grade level meetings have supported that grades 1 and 2 are seeking additional professional development on assessment design.

3. What conclusions did the team draw from analysis? And, what new questions (needing further investigation) emerged about the assessment repertoire?

The collection and analysis of randomly selected interim and summative assessments, teachers' lesson plans, teacher surveys, teacher interviews, and student logs supported that the vast majority of the summative assessments within the district are multiple choice-type tests and lack authenticity. The analysis of all artifacts provided the information necessary to organize our design team that will be charged with the duty of **designing an ELA Performance Based Summative Assessment with a focus on a writing component for grades 1 and 2.** (This team is to be composed of Grades 1 and 2 teachers, an interventionist or special education teacher, the Teacher on Special Assignment, and the Director of Instruction (when the administrator's schedule allows).

We also recommend that further artifact collection occur to determine if any assessments at the K-5 levels could be recommended for elimination. This is to be undertaken by the Teacher on Special Assignment and the Director of Instruction.

4. What assessments will be eliminated, revised, and added to the repertoire examined?

The following assessments will be eliminated:

We have already eliminated the pre-tests given to K-5 that were related to SLOs because they did not drive instruction and therefore were not purposeful. Further examination is needed at the building level as to what additional assessments should be eliminated.

The following assessments will be revised:

We are proposing for our official DESIGN TEAM to incorporate more performance based assessments in the Grades 1 and 2 Summative Assessment to engage students, to increase their problem solving abilities, and to develop inquiry and creativity. We will also be recommending that our teachers attend the content-specific workshops and that the district considers developing special area design teams to work with BOCES.

The following assessment(s) will be designed:

At this point, we do not have a recommendation as to adding more assessments.

5. What future work is the team recommending? (to continue review, to gather more data, to revise or design performance-based assessments, etc.)

This team makes the following recommendations for future work:

1. Buildings should determine what assessments should be eliminated
2. Thought needs to be given to future small-group assessment review based on the training provided by L-C I.
3. A minimum of two teachers from each discipline {Art, Music, Mathematics, ELA, Science, PE, Health, LOTE, K-2 (those not attending the Design Team Dates), SPED, Social Studies, and TECHNOLOGY} should attend the Content Area Dates.
4. Comments from the K-5 Teacher ELA Assessment Report indicate the need to ascertain whether or not anyone does anything with the results of the final exam aside from establishing SLO scores.

6. How will you inform parents about the review findings and work?

Parent University/Parent Night

MS Parent Group meeting

BOE presentation

Information disseminated at budget vote

PTO presentation

Gator Communicator article

If the focus of this assessment review is considered narrow this year, the district plans to use the same process to examine the quality of additional assessments next school year to continue to improve the quality of the local assessments currently in use and reduce the number of assessments that do not inform instruction.