SEDALIA #200
SCHOOL DISTRICT

TEACHER
EVALUATION
GUIDELINES

2016-2017

INTRODUCTION

The *Network for Educator Effectiveness (NEE)* is a comprehensive system designed to help educators improve student learning. NEE is applicable for all educators in all grade levels and subject areas in both public and private schools. NEE offers school districts several advantages.

- There is an emphasis on coaching, leading to **growth.**
- The meanings of scores assigned to teachers are clear and transparent.
- Truly useful information is provided.
- There is a sense of teamwork among educators, ensuring that all are working together to improve teaching practices.
- Administrators evaluate teachers **consistently** after standardized training.
- NEE is fair, trustworthy, and applied equally for all educators.
- Evaluations are intended for improvement, rather than as a part of a merit pay system.
- NEE generates data about which teaching practices are most effective.
- NEE gives educators a common language and an opportunity for discussions about effective teaching by identifying both areas of strength and areas for improvement.

KEY CONCEPT: NEE IS A POWERFUL TOOL FOR DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE EDUCATORS. THE EMPHASIS IS ALWAYS ON GROWTH.

CONFIDENTIALITY POLICY

The NEE confidentiality policy conforms to current Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) guidelines and has been approved by legal counsel. The policy protects the confidentiality of individual educators.

The NEE agreement with member districts states:

> ***All data entered into NEE's digital storage space by the District is owned by the District. All reports requested by and generated for the District shall be owned by the District and may be used by the District in any manner it deems appropriate.***
>
> ***The District shall indemnify, defend and hold the University, its current or former Curators, officers, employees and affiliates from and against all claims and expenses, including legal expenses and reasonable attorneys' fees, arising out of the use by the District of the NEE Services.***

One important exception to school district ownership of data is the student survey. In order to collect the most valid and honest data from students, teachers are asked to not be in the room at the time the student survey is completed. On the survey, students are explicitly told:

"YOUR ANSWERS ARE CONFIDENTIAL. YOUR TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL WILL NOT SEE YOUR RESPONSES. RESEARCHERS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI WILL REPORT THE GROUP RESPONSES FOR THE CLASS AS A WHOLE TO YOUR PRINCIPAL AND YOUR TEACHER."

Sedalia #200 School District

Administrator and Teacher NEE Evaluation Timeline

2016-2017

Month		Teacher Evaluation
August		• Share implementation plan with faculty • Discuss evaluation process • Discuss PDP • Highlight four focus indicators • Review unit of instruction (UOI) template with faculty •
September		• Begin observations (see calendar for evaluation cycle) • Implement professional-development aligned to support focus indicators • Guide new/returning faculty to understand PDP and UOI • Identify struggling faculty and review or write PIP to address deficiencies (ongoing)
October		• Continue faculty observations • Target professional development needs using NEE observation data • New/Returning Teacher and Administrator PDP conferences occur
November		• Continue faculty observations • Review progress of faculty UOIs (ongoing) • Conduct mid-year appraisal of school wide performance and improvement areas
December		• Continue observations of faculty • Complete UOI for 1st semester
January		• Continue faculty observations • Review Mid-Year PDP with faculty
February		• Continue faculty observations • Student surveys • Collect faculty UOIs by 2/28/17 • Summative Conferences for non-tenured faculty and scoring of PDP
March		• Continue faculty observations • Personnel recommendations due to Central Office • Begin summative conferences with tenured faculty
April		• Continue faculty observations • Continue summative conferences with faculty • Complete and share feedback on new UOI by 4/5/16
May		• Meet with faculty to discuss PDP focus and development for 2017-2018 • Begin new UOI for 2017/2018

Sedalia #200 School District
NEE Educator Evaluation System Process

NEE Evaluation System Format

- All teachers will receive four classroom observation visits with a feedback conference within 48 hours of the observation.

- First year teachers will receive a total of six to seven classroom observation visits with feedback conference within 48 hours of the observation.

- All teachers (unless otherwise specified) will create individually or in teams, one unit of instruction (UOI) to highlight instructional practices, scaffolding of learning, and frequent checks of understanding. Pre-assessment and post assessment student growth measures will be conducted on an individual class basis.

- All teachers' grades 4-12 will have a student survey conducted at least once every 3 years during 2nd semester.

- All teachers will implement a professional development plan anchored to district/building goals and that supports the district indicators.

- All teachers will receive a summative evaluation report during the 2nd semester. Those on the evaluation cycle will review and sign off on the summative evaluation report during conferencing in late February or March.

- Building principals will share the four indicators (three district and one building) that will be the focus of the evaluation tool during the 2016-2017.

- The administrative team and consultants (if applicable) will facilitate job-embedded professional development focused upon the four indicators and the creation of highly impactful unit of instructions during the 2016-2017 school year.

- Administrators have the option of adding indicators to address areas of concern for individual teachers.

- Those teachers having areas of concern can be placed on a Professional Improvement Plan (see attached) which could be job threatening.

SCORING RUBRIC	EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE AND "LOOK-FORS"
Indicator 1.2 – The teacher cognitively engages students in the content.	
0 – The teacher does not cognitively engage students in the content.	• Does not use cognitive engagement strategies* to promote thinking about the content • Students are not cognitively engaged in the content • ECE – Does not provide opportunities to learn new skills or content; Does not encourage extension of discovery/play
1 – The teacher seldom cognitively engages students in the content.	• Ineffectively uses one or more potentially weak cognitive engagement strategies* to promote thinking about the content • Only cognitively engages one student at a time • ECE – Seldom reviews content; Seldom encourages extension of discovery/play; Few learners are cognitively immersed in learning activities/centers
3 – The teacher occasionally cognitively engages students in the content less than half of the time, or with fewer than half of the students.	• Uses appropriate cognitive engagement strategies* but not effectively • Misses opportunities for thinking about the content • Some students are cognitively engaged • Many students are minimally cognitively engaged • ECE – Occasionally reviews content; Occasionally encourages extension of discovery/play; Some learners interacting with content cognitively some of the time; Some learners are cognitively immersed in learning activities/centers
5 – The teacher often cognitively engages students in the content more than half of the time, or with more than half of the students.	• Uses appropriate cognitive engagement strategies* effectively most of the time • Uses specific processing structures with students with some success • Most students are cognitively engaged much of the time • Recognizes if some students are not cognitively engaged, and tries alternate strategies to increase or maintain students' thinking about content • ECE – Often reviews and may spiral content; Often encourages extension of discovery/play; Many learners interact with content cognitively much of the time; Many learners are cognitively immersed in learning activities/centers
7 – The teacher almost always cognitively engages students in the content and engages almost all the students.	• Effectively uses cognitive engagement strategies* to promote thinking about the content almost all the time • Almost all students are cognitively engaged almost all the time • Uses specific processing structures with students with high success • Rapidly recognizes if some students are not cognitively engaged, and uses alternate strategies successfully to increase their thinking about content • Supports students in monitoring their own levels of cognitive engagement and in employing personal strategies to increase their engagement • ECE – Reviews frequently and spirals content; Consistently encourages extension of discovery/play; Almost all learners are cognitively immersed in learning activities/centers

**** Cognitive engagement strategies may include advanced organizers, K-W-L charts, share-out, shoulder-partner, connecting instruction/activities with students' lives, showing relevance, using authentic examples, presenting a puzzling problem, and inviting responses from all students.***

NOTE: There are three distinct types of engagement in the classroom – cognitive, affective, and behavioral. This indicator addresses cognitive engagement only. The other forms of engagement are addressed in Indicators 5.1 and 5.2.

Indicator 1.2 Clarification

Indicator 1.2 addresses the teacher's ability to **cognitively engage students in the content.** Cognitive engagement in the classroom refers to active mental involvement by students in the learning activities or active mental effort, such as meaningful processing, strategy use, concentration, and metacognition (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Alison, 2004; M.-T. Wang & Degol, 2014; Z. Wang, Bergin, & Bergin, 2014).

Cognitive engagement differs from **critical thinking (Indicator 4.1)**. Critical thinking can be thought of as a subset, or particular type, of cognitive engagement. A student who is thinking critically is cognitively engaged, but students can be cognitively engaged without thinking critically. This is very common in classrooms. For example, students may apply algorithms to practice math problems in a way that is cognitively engaging, but not critical thinking. In another example, a class may be playing a "Jeopardy" game to review past content. While this type of game is cognitively engaging for students, it is not critical thinking.

Cognitive engagement differs from **behavioral engagement (Indicator 5.2)**. Behavioral engagement refers to complying with behavior expected in the classroom. Students may be doing assigned tasks or answering questions in a perfunctory way in class without active mental effort or meaningful processing.

Cognitive engagement differs from **affective (or emotional) engagement (Indicator 5.1)**. Affective engagement refers to enjoying or being interested in a lesson. Students could be having a lot of fun with a lesson without active mental effort or meaningful processing. For example, imitating Elvis Presley in a lesson on pop culture may be fun, but not likely to involve active mental effort or meaningful processing.

While these types of engagement are separate, they tend to be correlated. A student who is compliant and interested in a lesson is likely to be mentally engaged as well. It is also possible for a student who appears to be not interested in the lesson (e.g., the student playing in the back of the room) to sometimes answer a question in a way that shows he has been intensely cognitively engaged.

There are a variety of ways teachers can promote cognitive engagement.

- Advanced organizers.
- K-W-L charts.
- Share-out.
- Shoulder-partner.
- Connecting instruction/activities with students' lives to show relevance.
- Use authentic examples.
- Present a puzzling problem.
- Invite responses from all students.

High-quality implementation may also include the recognition that an engagement strategy is not working and that a different strategy needs to be tried.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Alison, H. P. (2004). School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59-109.

Wang, M.-T., & Degol, J. (2014). Staying Engaged: Knowledge and Research Needs in Student Engagement. *Child Development Perspectives, 8*(3), 137-143. doi: 10.1111/cdep.12073

Wang, Z., Bergin, C., & Bergin, D. A. (2014). Measuring engagement in fourth to twelfth grade classrooms: The Classroom Engagement Inventory. *School Psychology Quarterly, 29*(4), 517-535. doi: 10.1037/spq0000050 10.1037/spq0000050.supp (Supplemental)

Standard 4: Teaches for Critical Thinking

SCORING RUBRIC	EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE AND "LOOK-FORS"
Indicator 4.1 – The teacher uses instructional strategies that lead students to problem-solving and critical thinking.	
0 – The teacher does not use instructional strategies to promote student problem-solving or critical thinking skills.	• Students are not involved in problem-solving or critical thinking
1 – The teacher seldom uses instructional strategies that require students to problem-solve and think critically.	• Seldom uses questions that demand more than basic recall or mere opinion • Almost always responds to own questions without wait time for student response • Uses routine applications of known procedures, or highly guided or constrained tasks
3 – The teacher occasionally uses instructional strategies that require students to problem-solve and think critically less than half of the time, or with fewer than half of the students.	• Occasionally uses instructional strategies that require some students to reason, problem-solve, and think critically (e.g., to assess or develop an informed argument, weigh credibility of evidence, justify or evaluate thinking, use cause-and-effect charts) • Uses some higher-order questions with skill (e.g., "how do you know?" or "why do others come to a different conclusion?"), but is not consistent • May provide opportunities for higher-order thinking (e.g., compare, analyze, infer, evaluate, explain, justify) without appropriate follow-through • Mostly uses routine applications of known procedures • May provide too much or too little scaffolding for problem solving
5 – The teacher often uses instructional strategies that require students to problem-solve and think critically more than half of the time, or with more than half of the students.	• Often uses instructional strategies that require most students to reason, problem-solve, and think critically • Models critical thinking and steps necessary to problem-solve for students, but misses some opportunities • May allow students to problem-solve independently instead of providing step-by-step instructions • Implements meaningful learning experiences that require most students to apply disciplinary knowledge to real-world problems
7 – The teacher almost always uses instructional strategies that engage almost all students in learning activities to promote problem-solving and critical thinking continuously through almost all the lesson.	• If time allows, progresses fluently through multiple instructional strategies that require almost all students to think critically and problem-solve • Consistently requires students to explain or justify their thinking, problem-solve, formulate questions, predict, be creative, or make informed decisions • Almost all students consistently engage in individual or collaborative critical thinking and problem-solving, analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and creation of original products • Strongly models critical thinking
NOTE: In ECE, critical thinking may involve allowing learners to use materials in unique ways, looking at problems in different ways, generating their own ideas, or actively discovering, investigating, exploring, constructing, and creating. Also may involve letting learners take risks, experiment, and make mistakes. Another example includes allowing learners to lead and then following their lead.	

Indicator 4.1 Clarification

Indicator 4.1 addresses the teacher's ability to **draw students into skillfully applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information to reach a conclusion or solve a problem**. Promoting critical thinking (CT) and problem-solving skills is difficult and fairly uncommon in typical classrooms.

There are a variety of ways teachers can promote CT.

- Ask challenging questions – not just yes/no questions.
- Give students complex, demanding tasks that require persistent effort, concentration, and various cognitive and metacognitive strategies.
- Require students to determine what makes an argument valid, assess possible solutions, categorize problems, map concepts, or explain a worked example.
- Ask students to justify their thinking or evaluate others' thinking.
- Ask students to generate questions and problems, independently collect and assess relevant information in the content, and come to an extended conclusion/justification that works to solve complex issues.

Every incident of the phrase "solve a problem" does not necessarily involve CT. For example, a teacher in a math class may ask students to "solve the problems on page 17" or "come to the board and solve the problem." These tasks are CT only if they have the properties listed above. However, if the tasks merely involve a student applying a scripted algorithm, then the "problem-solving" is not CT.

Note that CT is not always appropriate in a given observation period. There are times when students should be practicing and over-learning skills that are foundational to higher-level CT. However, CT should occur at some point in every classroom. For school districts in which CT is a prioritized indicator, we recommend that evaluators come back at another time if an activity is occurring in a classroom that is appropriate, but affords little opportunity for CT (e.g., practicing multiplication tables so that these become automatic). To maintain the "drop in" nature of classroom observations, but increase the likelihood that CT will be in evidence, the evaluator may ask the teacher for multiple suggested times to "drop in" and then randomly select one of them.

SCORING RUBRIC	EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE AND "LOOK-FORS"
Indicator 7.4 – The teacher monitors the effect of instruction on the whole class and individual learning.	
NOTE: Must take corrective action, if needed and appropriate, to score above a 2.	
0 – The teacher does not check the effect of instruction on the whole class or individual learning.	• Does not assess whether students have achieved the lesson objective • Does not engage in on-the-spot assessment
1 – The teacher seldom conducts formative, on-the-spot assessment of learning for the whole class or individual students and does not take needed corrective action.	• Seldom monitors learning progress • May superficially use question and answer as assessment • Minimal follow-up or checking for understanding • Monitors learning somewhat, but does not take corrective action
3 – The teacher occasionally conducts formative, on-the-spot assessment of learning for the whole class and individual students and takes corrective action as needed, less than half of the time, or for fewer than half of the students.	• Occasionally quickly assesses understanding of some students before moving on to the next learning activity • Occasionally uses techniques to monitor learning progress (e.g., observing classroom interactions or student work, questioning, thumbs up, fist-to-five, white boarding, exit slips) • May monitor progress of the class as a whole • If needed and appropriate, some corrective action is taken
5 – The teacher often conducts formative, on-the-spot assessment of learning for the whole class and individual students and takes corrective action as needed more than half of the time, or for more than half of the students.	• Often monitors learning progress of most students • Monitors the whole class and many individuals • May use multiple checks for understanding • Often adjusts instruction using students' responses to questions and discussions, correcting misconceptions, or monitoring other feedback • Takes corrective action as needed and appropriate for the class as a whole and most individual students
7 – The teacher almost always conducts formative, on-the-spot assessment of learning and takes corrective action as needed for both the whole class and almost all individual students.	• Systematically monitors learning progress • Continuously monitors progress in attaining instructional objectives for the whole class and for each student • On-the-spot assessment is seamless throughout instruction • Strong, appropriate corrective action is taken to ensure learning of almost all students
In ECE, the same look-fors are applicable, but the method of assessment may place greater reliance on informal teacher observation, portfolios, data tracking sheets, and anecdotal notes. In addition, evaluators may want to focus on percentage of time rather than percentage of students. Teachers often cannot assess all three-year-olds at once, although some activities may provide quick checks for understanding among all learners. Assessment should be developmentally appropriate, may involve scaffolding, and be tailored to individual learner's zone of proximal development.	

Indicator 7.4 Clarification

Indicator 7.4 addresses the teacher's ability to **monitor the effect of instruction on individual students and the whole class.** It is about formative assessment of a particular kind. Formative assessment has multiple meanings, but in NEE we use the term to refer to quick checks for understanding as the lesson is progressing. The purpose is to inform modification of teaching and learning activities in real time. It is information used to guide instruction as part of the instructional process.

There are a variety of ways teachers can conduct quick checks for understanding.

- Questioning (most common form)
- Solving problems on a whiteboard
- Answering spot quizzes with fist-to-five, thumbs up, or clicker techniques

To score high on Indicator 7.4, the teacher must also take appropriate corrective action when modifications to instruction need to be made. Strong, corrective action can be in the form of modifying the lesson if a high number of students are not understanding, providing scaffolding as students work through cognitive errors or incorrect answers, or asking further questions to ascertain whether students are mastering the objectives of the lesson.

Teacher Professional Development Plan (TPDP)
Scoring Rubric
AY 2015-2016

0 – The TPDP makes no explicit connection to building or district goals/priorities. Goals/priorities are not named.
2 – The TPDP partially aligns with building or district goals/priorities.
4 – The TPDP explicitly focuses on and aligns with building or district goals/priorities.

0 – The TPDP does not refer to data used to determine professional development goals.
2 – The TPDP presents minimal data (e.g., principal evaluations, student test scores) and a limited discussion of how it was used to determine professional development goals.
4 – The TPDP presents data from multiple sources and clearly describes how it was used to determine professional development goals.

0 – The TPDP includes only one type of activity that is remotely related to the professional development goal(s).
2 – The TPDP includes more than one substantial activity (more than 4 clock-hours each) that are moderately related to the professional development goal(s).
4 – The TPDP includes at least three substantial activities that are strongly related to the professional development goal(s).

0 – The TPDP does not refer to the use of research to select professional development content, activities, or processes.
2 – The TPDP minimally refers to research and how it informed the selection of professional development content, activities, or processes.
4 – The TPDP explicitly cites research and describes how it informed the selection of professional development content, activities, or processes.

0 – The TPDP does not include collaboration.
2 – The TPDP includes some collaboration (e.g., occasional participation in a learning team).
4 – The TPDP includes ongoing collaboration in a learning community for a specified educational outcome. Format may vary based on accessibility.

0 – The TPDP does not discuss strategies to improve student engagement in the learning process.
2 – The TPDP includes a limited discussion of strategies to improve student engagement in the learning process.
4 – The TPDP explicitly discusses strategies to improve student engagement in the learning process.

0 – The TPDP does not discuss strategies that will improve the ability to meet the varied needs of diverse learners.
2 – The TPDP includes a limited discussion of strategies that will improve the ability to meet the varied needs of diverse learners.
4 – The TPDP explicitly discusses strategies that will improve the ability to meet the varied needs of diverse learners.

0 – The TPDP does not refer to the individual's participation in prior professional development.
2 – The TPDP vaguely or minimally refers to prior professional development.
4 – The TPDP explicitly builds upon prior professional development.
NOTE: Score Element 8 as "Not Applicable" (N/A) for first-year teachers or for veteran teachers beginning a new PD venture.

0 – The TPDP does not include evidence.
2 – The TPDP includes some limited data-based evidence of change in practice and its effects on student learning.
4 – The TPDP clearly documents data-based evidence of change in practice and its effects on student learning. The TPDP specifies a performance metric.

NEE
Network for Educator Effectiveness
College of Education
University of Missouri

Unit of Instruction Scoring Rubric

The unit objectives...
0 – are not aligned with the BOE-approved content standards and curriculum, or no unit objectives are stated.
2 – are clearly aligned with the BOE-approved content standards and curriculum in at least half of the cases.
4 – are all clearly aligned with the BOE-approved content standards and curriculum.

The unit of instruction...
0 – does not include essential and guiding questions.
2 – includes minimal essential and guiding questions, or questions that do not fully capture the unit objectives.
4 – includes clear and complete essential and guiding questions that fully capture the unit objectives.

The unit of instruction...
0 – does not include essential or guiding questions that promote high-level thinking, or no essential or guiding questions are present.
2 – includes essential or guiding questions with at least half clearly promoting depth-of-knowledge levels 3 and 4 (strategic thinking or extended thinking) or the higher levels in Bloom's Taxonomy (applying, analyzing, evaluating, synthesizing, creating).
4 – includes essential or guiding questions that all clearly promote depth-of-knowledge levels 3 and 4 or the higher levels in Bloom's Taxonomy.

**In Assessment for Learning (AFL) schools, the "learning target" may be equivalent to and used in lieu of essential or guiding questions.*

The instructional elements (e.g., learner activities, student work samples, and assessments)...
0 – are not directly linked to the unit objectives, or no unit objectives are stated.
2 – directly link to the unit objectives for at least half the elements, or the elements directly link to the unit objectives but are so few in number that linkage is unclear.
4 – all directly link to the unit objectives and the number of elements is sufficient to fully determine linkage.

The unit of instruction...
0 – contains no data collection elements for either formative or summative assessment.
2 – contains appropriate data collection for either, but not both, formative or summative assessment. Data may be collected for both, but not clearly or systematically collected and used.
4 – contains clear, systematic data collection for both formative and summative assessments that are well-integrated into the unit. Evidence is provided.

The unit-level plans...
0 – do not include research-based instructional strategies.
2 – include one to two research-based instructional strategies that are minimally justified with evidence.
4 – include three or more research-based instructional strategies that are strongly justified with appropriate evidence.

** Research-based instructional strategies may include: testing, feedback, goals and sub-goals, vocabulary building, concept mapping (similarities and differences), capturing attention, spaced practice, summarizing and reviewing, reinforcing effort, using cognitively complex tasks, graphic organizers, academic play or games, note taking, clickers for voting, direct instruction, advanced organizers (activating prior knowledge), cooperative learning, and computer-assisted instruction.*

Instructional strategies for differentiated instruction...
0 – are not included for diverse learners.
2 – are vague, or limited to some categories of diverse learners.
4 – are clear and detailed for a variety of diverse learners.

The unit of instruction...
0 – contains no process for leading students in self-reflection about their personal goals regarding the unit objectives.
2 – contains a vague or minimal process in which the teacher leads students in self-reflection about their personal goals regarding the unit objectives.
4 – contains a strong, clear process in which the teacher leads students in effective self-reflection about their personal goals regarding the unit objectives. Evidence is provided.

The unit of instruction...
0 – contains no supporting materials.
2 – contains a minimal number (about half) of appropriate supporting materials, such as comparative student work samples/anchor papers, schedules/pacing guides, task outlines, scoring guides/rubrics, assessments, or other appropriate resources for instruction.
4 – contains a full array of appropriate, supporting materials.

The unit of instruction...
0 – does not describe how use of available and appropriate technology promotes student engagement and learning.
2 –minimally describes how use of available and appropriate technology promotes student engagement and learning.
4 – fully describes how optimal use of available and appropriate technology promotes student engagement and learning.

NEE
Network for Educator Effectiveness

Unit of Instruction
Scoring Look Fors

Section 1: Specific Content Objectives (Learning Targets)

-Contain a description of an overt demonstration of a performance or cognitive function.

-Functions align with the functions described in the standards.

-Describe the conditions under which the performance will occur (after reading.....).

-State or imply the evaluation criteria of meeting the learning targets.

Sections 2 and 3: Essential and Guiding Questions

-Essential questions are open to multiple perspectives which may invite discussion and debate.

-Essential questions generate unpredictable student responses.

-Essential questions generate more open-ended questions that drive and sustain student inquiry.

-Essential questions naturally recur and facilitate interdisciplinary connections.

-Essential questions illustrate concepts and principles within the UOI that will serve students throughout their lives.

-Guiding questions build an important foundation toward understanding the more complex questions.

-Guiding questions call for more details.

-A set of guiding questions is comprehensive and can serve as a scope and sequence of the unit.

Section 4: Unit of Instruction Elements Directly Link to Learning Objective

-Alignment of UOI elements (learner activities, student work samples, and assessments) closely align to learning objectives.

-Learning activities clearly support and connect to learning objectives.

Section 5: Formative Assessment and Assessment of Mastery

-Specific assessments are noted that specify which concepts/skills/learning targets will be measured.

-There is alignment between formative and summative assessments to support mastery of specific standard or learning target.

-The approach to responding to assessment results will outline how the teacher will determine next steps (one-on-one, small groups, whole group remediation or acceleration).

-Summative assessments match with the cognitive demands (DOK levels) of the standards and learning targets.

-If a standardized assessment is used as the summative assessment, questions/constructed responses must align with content and performance objectives.

-The UOI outlines how summative assessment results will inform instructional planning and eventually instructional delivery.

-Ultimately summative assessment methods require students to apply the knowledge and skills acquired during the UOI to new or unfamiliar context.

Section 6: Instructional Strategies

-UOI refers to a specific application of research based instructional strategies to support learning content and development of communication skills.

-UOI cites evidence of effectiveness of strategies utilized.

-Instructional strategies are connected to match UOI elements in section 4.

Section 7: Diverse Learners

-UOI refers to a specific scaffolding or acceleration strategy that is clearly aligned to a research base.

-UOI presents more than one mode of presentation of information (visual, kinesthetic, video recordings, real world experiences/labs/objects, or assistive technology sources).

-UOI describes multiple ways students engage with and process information (graphic organizers, structured conversations, demonstrations, or computer software).

Section 8: Student Reflection

-There is an explanation of the process or a reflection tool attached that will allow students to monitor their growth, in an age-appropriate manner, in relation to specific learning strategies.

-Does the student goal setting process provide a roadmap to the improvement of academic performance, increase motivation to achieve, increase pride and satisfaction in performance, and improve self-confidence?

-Goal settings templates include: student choice in goal setting, goals expressed in a positive manner (To improve my spelling...), accurate goals that outline a timeline and measurement benchmark for improvement, clear priorities with in the goals, includes small immediate goals, the setting of goals that students feel they have control over, and goals that are SMART in nature.

Section 9: Supporting Resources

-Provide a description of the technology resources used to facilitate the learning process. Specially include how you used the SAMR model to increase the level of technology integration used for this UOI.

Section 10: Family and Community Involvement

-UOI clearly describes examples of how families and the community can become collaborators in the instructional process (homework assistance, reading nights, field trips, and guest speakers).

Section 11: Self-Reflection about the UOI

-How would you teach this UOI differently?

-Did you see the clear alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment upon completion of this UOI?

-Are there resources that could be added to enhance this UOI?

Developing Essential Questions

How do I develop quality essential questions for my students' instruction and assessment?

First, what should they do? (McTighe and Wiggens (2013) state to test your questions against these fundamentals)

- They should stimulate ongoing thinking and inquiry
- They're arguable , with multiple plausible answers
- They raise further questions
- They spark discussion and debate
- They demand evidence and reasoning because varying answers exist
- They point to big ideas and pressing issues
- They fruitfully recur throughout the unit or year
- The answers proposed are tentative and may change in light of new experiences and deepening understanding

More information on developing essential questions...

1. Pause and contemplate the questions you develop. Self-assess and ask if the student must think about all the possible moves/options and which one to use in each specific situation.
2. Does the question invite inquiry and argument? If the question is factual, then what question on the same topic is worth arguing about?
3. When planning questions make a T chart and separate factual questions and essential questions covering a unit of instruction. This is to avoid leaning too much on factual questioning.
4. Ask questions such as... "What's the value of?" "When should we?" "When shouldn't we?"
5. Is the question general enough to use across units? Or too narrowly confined to one topic?
6. Example: In Lobel's story, "Frog and Toad", instead of asking, "How do Frog and Toad act like friends?"; ask, "Who is a true friend?". This generalizes the question and expands it to other areas and even personalized experiences.
7. Example: Instead of asking, "What is the difference between fiction and non-fiction?"; ask, "When is fiction revealing, and when is it a lie?"
8. Make questions counterintuitive, odd, and more easily misunderstood.
9. Don't spend too much time 'word smithing'. Don't write and edit simultaneously. Write then edit.
10. Aim for these three kinds of learning: acquisition, making meaning, and transfer.
11. What attempts at application will raise the right arguments and require further generalizations.
12. Build lessons into Socratic seminar, formal debate, and problem based projects.

Bottom line – High level inquiries and questioning yield the greatest gains.