Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.1 *School-wide and student data generated by a variety of tools are used to monitor, review, and evaluate the curriculum and co-curricular programs; to plan for continued and sustained student growth; and to monitor and assess faculty performance.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 8.1 is about the use of school wide and student data to monitor, review and evaluate curriculum and co-curricular programs, student growth, and faculty performance. Through analysis of school wide data related to curricular and co-curricular programs, faculty members can connect student academic growth to alignment of curriculum and assessment for a clearer picture of the relationship between what is taught and what is learned by individual students, as well as trends in growth within and across grade levels. The administration and staff believes that data can point to means of success as well as need for improvement for purposes of the flow of curriculum, co-curricular alignment to enhance curriculum, effective instruction, appropriate methodology, and success of teachers to clearly communicate concepts and challenge students to think critically. The variety of assessments utilized in the school is diverse and vetted and the processes for analysis of data gathered are among those recommended by quality research. So the evidence that a school "fully meets" this benchmark likely includes the names of the assessments; the purposes of those assessments as related to curriculum, co-curricular programs, student growth, and faculty performance; description of the data gathered; and the processes utilized for analysis of the data gathered. A plan is employed for sustaining effective measures and for implementing new practices as a result of the analysis of data. Minutes or recorded discussion of faculty meetings, learning communities, or gatherings indicating the collection of data and a review of the findings as related to trends, impact, academic needs, or professional development are evident. Analysis of data is present. Data alone does not constitute a "fully met" status.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are a few fundamental guiding questions which will help frame this item:

- What constitutes our school-wide and student data?

- School wide indicates <u>all</u> faculty members must comply with school requirement to administer required assessments and properly submit assessment results for tally. Are all faculty members involved in using

Benchmark 8.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.1 *School-wide and student data generated by a variety of tools are used to monitor, review, and evaluate the curriculum and co-curricular programs; to plan for continued and sustained student growth; and to monitor and assess faculty performance.*

assessments, properly submitting assessment results, and participating in the analysis of data? How do we utilize school wide data? What do we do with the data? Who reviews the data?

- Which tools are we using to generate this data?

- Are the tools varied?

- How do we utilize our school wide and student data to monitor, review and evaluate our curriculum?

- How do we utilize our school wide and student data to monitor, review and evaluate our co-curricular programs?

- In what ways have we utilized school wide and student data to plan for continued and sustained student growth?

- In what ways have we utilized school wide and student data to monitor and assess faculty performance?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

the use of data to monitor, review, or evaluate curriculum and co-curricular programming is robust. Student growth data is reviewed and tied to teacher evaluation.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

all elements of level three are present and targeted professional development is made available to teachers when student growth is not adequate. Teachers receive recognition for student growth that is at expected or beyond expected levels.

Benchmark 8.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.1 *School-wide and student data generated by a variety of tools are used to monitor, review, and evaluate the curriculum and co-curricular programs; to plan for continued and sustained student growth; and to monitor and assess faculty performance.*

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

> the use of data is minimal or inconsistent when monitoring, reviewing, or evaluating curriculum and co-curricular programs. Understanding of student growth data is minimal. Student growth data has little impact on teacher evaluation.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

> the generation of student data is not systematic or, if it is systematic, the results are not used to monitor, review or evaluate curriculum. Faculty do not review student growth data. Evaluation of faculty does not include review of student data. Data from co-curricular programs are not considered.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Create a means to systemically generate school-wide and student data in some subject areas
- Begin to utilize data to monitor, review or evaluate the curriculum and/or co-curricular programs
- Identify some valid ways to measure student growth
- Provide professional development to faculty about using assessment data
- Begin to consider growth data as connected to faculty performance

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Incorporate a greater variety of tools for generating school-wide and assessment data for curriculum <u>and</u> co-curricular programs
- Set expectations that faculty will use data to monitor, review, <u>and</u> evaluate curriculum and co-curricular programs <u>and</u> plan for continued and sustained student growth
- Provide professional development for support
- Utilize student growth data to monitor and assess student data as part of the faculty performance
- Create a data platform that makes it easy for faculty to collect, report, and use data

Benchmark 8.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.1 *School-wide and student data generated by a variety of tools are used to monitor, review, and evaluate the curriculum and co-curricular programs; to plan for continued and sustained student growth; and to monitor and assess faculty performance.*

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Utilize a variety of tools that include standardized and norm referenced evaluations to generate school-wide and student growth data
- Align assessment tools and curriculum so that data generated fully aligns and is valid and reliable
- Offer targeted professional development when faculty performance data indicates deficits in teaching practice
- Recognize teachers for best practice when student growth data indicates superior teaching and student learning

> **V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to Glossary for the key terms listed below.)**

Curriculum
Co-curricular
Student growth
Faculty performance

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.2 *School-wide and aggregated student data are normed to appropriate populations and are shared with all stakeholders.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 8.2 is about the assurance that school-wide and aggregated student data is normed to appropriate populations and that student data is shared with those invested in the school, for example: faculty, parents and families, students, parishioners, funders, and community partners. Evidence describes student achievement data discerned at regular intervals that represents all of the student body school wide. Reports of student data generated from students' individual testing events would be a common source of this data. Often such reports are generated by publishers of standardized tests for individual schools. While individual data for each student would be shared with administrators of the school, faculty instructing the student, parents/guardians of the student, and the student him/herself, this individual data is not shared beyond these very specific individuals. Aggregated data (data that combines individual student data by class, grade level, school, etc., to provide a "picture" of the entire school or a particular group in the school) is shared with stakeholders such as faculty, parents and families, students, parishioners, funders, and community partners. Evidence of the communication of school-wide and aggregated data might include items such as newsletters; minutes of board, faculty and large group parent meetings; parish bulletins; (arch)diocesan, local, and national newspapers; (arch)diocesan, parish and school websites; and radio and television programming.

Evidence describes the standardized testing employed at a school and the population on which that standardized test is based. Evidence from the norming procedures of the standardized test(s) would demonstrate that the test is based on a typical population to which students of the school belong. Examples of norms utilized in standardized achievement testing include the grade and age of students. Thus, for student data to be normed to appropriate populations, an investigation of the school's established standardized tests would demonstrate that the comparative scores indicating levels of performance were established through trials of the test with typical students from across the country whose grade and age is similar to students at the school. Data from reports generated by the standardized tests may indicate national percentiles and local percentiles. These percentiles may compare the school to other schools in the (arch)diocese, in a particular geographic region, or across the nation.

Benchmark 8.2 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.2 *School-wide and aggregated student data are normed to appropriate populations and are shared with all stakeholders.*

Evidence indicates the array of stakeholders to whom this school wide and aggregated data is communicated. A primary purpose of the communication with stakeholders is to demonstrate transparency about the academic achievement and growth of students in the school.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are a few fundamental guiding questions which will help frame this item:

- What kind of standardized tests does our school employ? How were these tests normed for population? Where is this information described in the standardized test information? What comparative statistics do the standardized test publisher's reports provide to the national and local/(arch)diocesan populations?

- What is our school wide data? How has this data been aggregated/combined? Is this data found in reports from the publisher of our standardized tests?

- How do we communicate with stakeholders? Does our communication include school wide and aggregated data? Is our communication clear? How do we know? Is our communication effective? How do we know? Is our communication transparent? How do we know?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

school-wide, aggregated data acquired from standardized tests is normed to populations that represent the school's students. This data is communicated to stakeholders, including students, parents/guardians, faculty, administrators, church community and broader regional communities. The data is clear and readily accessible and is communicated to stakeholders.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

Benchmark 8.2 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.2 *School-wide and aggregated student data are normed to appropriate populations and are shared with all stakeholders.*

> school-wide, aggregated data acquired from standardized tests are normed to populations that represent the school's students. It is communicated to stakeholders including students, parents/guardians, faculty, administrators, the church community and broader regional communities. In addition this communication of the school-wide, aggregated data is consistent and provided at regular, predictable intervals. The communication is clear, effective and transparent. The school uses a survey or other means to verify receipt and understanding by all stakeholders.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

> school-wide, aggregated data may or may not be normed to populations similar to the population of the school. If school-wide and aggregated data is communicated it may be at random intervals and to only some stakeholders.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

> school-wide, aggregated student data is not normed to a population that equates to the population of the school. Communication of this data is not communicated to stakeholders. Or, if the data is communicated, stakeholders cannot access it easily. It is likely that not all stakeholders have received communications. The data is either not gathered and communicated, not collected, or not normed or not communicated and not accessible.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Select a standardized test format that has been normed with a population that is inclusive of the population of the school
- Review means to communicate with stakeholders
- Begin communicating the school wide and aggregated data with some of the stakeholders of the school

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Locate standardized testing that provides evidence of norming the population aligned with the population of the school
- Obtain a reporting template that will allow comparisons of aggregated data with national and local schools

Benchmark 8.2 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.2 *School-wide and aggregated student data are normed to appropriate populations and are shared with all stakeholders.*

- Make a list of all stakeholders and a list of all means of communication.
- Create a communication plan that will insure communication with all stakeholders on a consistent, regular interval

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Ensure quality and consistency of communication of normed data
- Evaluate quality and consistency of communication considering school-wide aggregated data
- List all stakeholders and note the means to communicate data
- Regularly survey stakeholders and evaluate each of means of communication

> **V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the NCEA Glossary for the key terms listed below.)**

Aggregated
Normed to appropriate populations
Stakeholders
Transparent

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.3 *Faculty use a variety of curriculum-based assessments aligned with learning outcomes and instructional practices to assess student learning, including formative, summative, authentic performance and student self-assessment.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 8.3 is about the connection between curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Data is used to identify the practices/processes that are creating positive results and those are replicated to the greatest extent possible. This requires educators to place as much emphasis on formative feedback as on summative assessments, and support each other in the use of a variety of assessment practices. It means creating a shared vision of the role of assessment in learning and what constitutes growth-producing feedback, versus the role of traditional assessment. Only then can teachers fully embrace assessment as a means to an end, not just an end-point.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are a few fundamental guiding questions for teachers to ask (or to ask teachers) in order to be able to point to examples of the extent to which the assessment described in Benchmark 8.3 is actually taking place at the school:

- How does the curriculum (not the textbook) guide your instruction and assessment practices? Are assessments aligned with the curriculum?

- What artifacts do you have to show the use of a variety of assessment methods in different content areas?

- Do teachers use formative assessment? Summative assessment? Authentic assessment? Student self-assessment? If yes, how does each of these forms of assessment impact instructional practice?   How pervasive are these assessments in all grade levels and in all content areas?

- What input do students have into how they will demonstrate their learning?

- How are assessment practices aligned between grades and content areas?

Benchmark 8.3 CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.3 *Faculty use a variety of curriculum-based assessments aligned with learning outcomes and instructional practices to assess student learning, including formative, summative, authentic performance and student self-assessment.*

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark,**

teachers use formative assessment to adjust instruction quickly, while learning is in progress. Formative assessment is viewed as practice and student are not penalized for moving through the learning process.

The feedback provided to students gives them information as to where they are and what they have to do next. Students have options in how they will demonstrate their learning. The curriculum, not the textbook, guides instruction and assessment decisions. Assessments are authentic, stemming from real-world situations and scenarios. Assessments focus on critical-thinking and demonstrated learning. Teachers are expected to vary the types of assessment used in their classroom and they are given the time and support needed to become proficient in using them.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark,**

assessment tools and practices in all content areas are evaluated to determine their effectiveness in measuring what students know and are able to do and the context in which they will use their knowledge now and in the future. Formative assessment is used by students to self-assess and set goals, giving them control over their own learning. The school provides a student-centered, hands-on, project-based environment where assessments are authentic to real-world situations and scenarios. Assessments are designed to support individual student learning outcomes. Students and teachers continually use data from assessments to self-assess their teaching and learning practices to improve performance.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

there have been efforts by some teachers to vary the types of assessments they use. Although the textbook plays a major role in determining what assessments will be used in most classes, some efforts have been made to include formative assessment practices and providing options in demonstrating learning. There is some evidence that data from assessments are being used to inform instructional practices.

Benchmark 8.3 CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.3 *Faculty use a variety of curriculum-based assessments aligned with learning outcomes and instructional practices to assess student learning, including formative, summative, authentic performance and student self-assessment.*

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark,**

> teachers do not distinguish between teaching and learning. Assessments are generic and do not give a realistic picture of student learning. The textbook - rather than the expected learning outcomes identified in curriculum - dominates instruction and assessment. Traditional evaluation practices inhibit student learning by focusing on "one-size-fits-all" summative assessments and incorporating non-academic criteria (such as attendance, effort, and behavior).

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Determine the alignment of the textbook to the expected curriculum
- Support teachers in their use of a variety of assessment methods
- Promote collaboration in planning projects and designing assessments
- Establish an expectation of assessment results being used to inform instructional practices

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Define the role of assessment and develop grading practices school-wide that support teachers in designing assessments based on the curriculum and student learning needs
- Allow students to have a voice in how they will demonstrate their learning
- Work collaboratively to plan authentic performance tasks that are interdisciplinary and require the appropriate use of formative and summative assessments

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Institutionalize processes/protocols that allow teachers to continually evaluate their assessment practices based on student learning data
- Define expectations school-wide for authentic performance tasks that reflect high levels of rigor and relevance
- Adjust evaluation practices to support a student-centered, hands-on, project based environment

Benchmark 8.3 CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.3 *Faculty use a variety of curriculum-based assessments aligned with learning outcomes and instructional practices to assess student learning, including formative, summative, authentic performance and student self-assessment.*

- Continually ask students to self-reflect on their learning and set goals to give them control over their own learning
- Provide job-embedded and on-going support for teachers as they self-assess their assessment practices
- Design assessments to support individual student learning outcomes

V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the NCEA Glossary for the key terms listed below.)

Formative assessment
Summative assessment
Authentic performance
Rigor
Relevance

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.4 *Criteria used to evaluate student work and the reporting mechanisms are valid, consistent, transparent and justly administered.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 8.4 is about how faculty and professional staff members determine what a student has learned and how well the student has learned. Faculty and professional staff members must determine how they will measure whether a student has acquired a new skill or new knowledge and then report to students and parents about the students' progress.

Grading practices can vary greatly, yet some consistency is important in order to provide parents and students with a clear understanding of student progress. Clear learning expectations are delineated and a student's ability to demonstrate mastery of that expectation is be reported. It is important that students be allowed to demonstrate mastery in various ways in order for faculty and professional staff members to be confident that a student is making consistent academic progress. Using a single performance measure can be unfair assessment of a student's ability to reach a learning expectation. Therefore, it is necessary to allow students the flexibility to demonstrate mastery in diverse manners.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions which will help frame this item:

- Are the evaluations and assessments utilized a true measure of what it is we say we are measuring in student learning?

- Are we measuring student learning consistently for individual students and across students in the same grade level and content area?

- Are assessments administered fairly and with individual student performance preferences in mind?

- Are students and parents/guardians aware of criteria prior to administration of assessment? Do they understand the criteria?

- When reporting results of the evaluation of student learning is the information shared valid, consistent, transparent, and fair?

Benchmark 8.4 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.4 *Criteria used to evaluate student work and the reporting mechanisms are valid, consistent, transparent and justly administered.*

- Do those evaluating student work collaborate to ensure inner-rater reliability to ensure fair assessments of all student work?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

criteria used to evaluate student work and the reporting mechanisms are generally aligned with curriculum. Most assessments are valid, consistent, transparent, justly administered, and are easily accessed by students and families. How learning will be measured is usually articulated and understood by students at the outset of assignments. Faculty members meet regularly to ensure validity and build inter-rater reliability of many assessments. Assessment criteria are based on national best practices and shared with parents/guardians and students. Assessment criteria are often differentiated so that students can demonstrate mastery in a variety of ways.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

criteria used to evaluate student work and the reporting mechanisms are fully aligned with curriculum. Assessments across all subjects are valid, consistent, transparent, justly administered, and are easily accessed by students and families. How learning will be measured is articulated and understood by students at the outset of assignments. Faculty members meet regularly to ensure validity and build inter-rater reliability of assessments. Assessment criteria are based on national best practices and shared with parents/guardians and students. Assessment criteria are differentiated so that students can demonstrate mastery in a variety of ways. Communication with students and parents/families about assessment and criteria is regular and consistent.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

criteria used to evaluate student work and the reporting mechanisms are sometimes aligned with curriculum. Some assessments are valid, consistent, transparent, justly administered, and accessible to students and families, but this occurs inconsistently. How learning will be measured is occasionally articulated at the outset of assignments so that some students have an understanding of learning expectations. The faculty sometimes meets to

Benchmark 8.4 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.4 *Criteria used to evaluate student work and the reporting mechanisms are valid, consistent, transparent and justly administered.*

> ensure validity and to build inter-rater reliability of assessments, but this, too, is inconsistent. Assessment criteria are sometimes based on national best practices and shared with parents/guardians and students.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

> criteria used to evaluate student work are not valid and/or not communicated. The reporting mechanisms are not consistent, transparent, justly administered, or easily accessed by students and families.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Provide professional development for faculty and professional staff on how to create authentic assessments that successfully measure learning
- Increase opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery in a variety of ways
- Align assessments to learning expectations
- Work with faculty and professional staff to develop assessments based on national best practices

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Provide regular opportunities for faculty to validate assessments for reliability
- Provide professional development for faculty and professional staff on how to differentiate assessments to measure learning

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Monitor assessments to check for validity
- Provide opportunities for parents to learn more about assessments and how faculty and professional staff measure learning

---

V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the NCEA Glossary for the key terms listed below.)

Validity

Benchmark 8.4 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.5 *Faculty collaborate in professional learning communities to monitor individual and class-wide student learning through methods such as common formative assessments and rubrics.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 8.5 is about the *assessment* responsibilities of teachers in professional learning communities. Teachers collaborate in professional learning communities in order to increase student achievement.   It's all about the learning results. *Demonstrated* student learning results lie at the core of all PLC work.

Benchmark 7.7 - also about professional learning communities - provides the expectation that excellent Catholic schools *establish* PLCs as the way teachers work and collaborate to improve learning. Benchmark 8.5 zeroes in on the data-driven, results-oriented nature of the work of well-functioning PLCs.

That data-driven work can be succinctly described as follows: Once teachers working in PLCs agree on the important learning for the year or course, they design valid common assessments which they administer to all students in the subject/grade or course periodically throughout the instructional period (year, semester, quarter, or grading period). Teachers meet regularly in their PLCs to analyze the data from the common assessments and use it to adjust teaching so more students can successfully demonstrate proficiency. PLCs create and use rubrics and proficiency targets to ensure consistent measurement of learning results. As teacher teams progress, they are able to use learning data from the previous year to set achievement goals for their current students. As they monitor student learning as demonstrated on the common assessments, they use the data to set objectives and adjust instructional strategies in order to better reach the learning goals.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are a few fundamental guiding questions for teachers to ask (or to ask teachers) in order to be able to point to examples of the extent to which the work of PLCs described in Benchmark 8.5 is actually taking place at the school:

- What are the learning goals your PLC has established for this year for your students? Are they S.M.A.R.T. goals?

Benchmark 8.5 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.5 *Faculty collaborate in professional learning communities to monitor individual and class-wide student learning through methods such as common formative assessments and rubrics.*

- What common assessments has your PLC created to measure student learning in relation to the S.M.A.R.T. Goals?

- How are members of the PLC collecting and analyzing learning data?

- What evidence can you show that adjustments in teaching have been made based on data and aimed at increasing student learning results?

- What proficiency targets have you set in relation to the targeted learning?

- How are you using rubrics to measure student performance?

- How do you interpret the learning results you see?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

> teachers are working in professional learning communities that meet regularly to analyze the results of common assessments they have given to all their students. They have set goals based on the level of learning they want to see demonstrated by their students and they are working to improve curriculum and instruction to reach those goals.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

> the teachers' work in PLCs as described in level 3 bears clear results. That is, teacher teams are highly adept at using data to set learning goals, designing common formative assessments aligned to the learning goals, analyzing the results on the common assessments, and using those results to adjust their teaching so more students actually reach or exceed proficiency. The work of PLCs is deliberate, intentional and reflective. Teachers can explain and justify the goals they set, and they can give good reasons (including data-based reasons) for the adjustments they make to their teaching and for their students' performance. PLCs share their work with the larger school community.

Benchmark 8.5 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.5 *Faculty collaborate in professional learning communities to monitor individual and class-wide student learning through methods such as common formative assessments and rubrics.*

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

> teachers use PLC meeting time to talk about student performance. They may examine available assessment data and suggest alternative strategies to try for improvement, but they are not yet creating and administering common formative assessments in a regular and consistent way and basing decisions on the results.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

> teachers are not working together to assess student performance.

NOTE: A school's score on this benchmark essentially depends on how well teachers understand how to design good common assessments and then use the data that come from these assessments to make instructional decisions that get better results next time, and over the long haul. The more skilled and intentional teachers are at making specific and accurate connections among learning goals, common assessments, proficiency targets, and teaching decisions, the higher the school's score on this benchmark.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Form professional learning communities
- Set an agenda for them to begin to examine student performance and determine how to improve achievement

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Provide professional development and coaching for teachers in PLCs to be able to set S.M.A.R.T. goals, design common formative assessments, collect and analyze results which they use to adjust teaching in order to improve learning.
- Monitor the work of the PLCs and provide support as needed.

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

8.5 *Faculty collaborate in professional learning communities to monitor individual and class-wide student learning through methods such as common formative assessments and rubrics.*

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Provide on-going professional development tailored to the needs of each PLC.
- Establish a culture of sharing PLC work and results across the school.

> **V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the NCEA Glossary for the key terms listed below.)**

Common Formative Assessment
Rubric
Proficiency Target
Data-driven
Results-oriented
S.M.A.R.T. Goals
Learning Results