Assessment Inventory

Assessment	Code Related or Meaning Related?	Specific Skill(s) Measured

Assessment Inventory

	Assessment	Purpose	Literacy Skills Measured (code related, meaning related)
Diagnostic			
Screening			
Progress Monitoring			
Outcome			

Risk Profile (Resource Version)

Student	
Instructional Profile	
Information from Test Booklets	
Information from Diagnostic Assessment	
Summary of Strengths and Difficulties	

Classroom Performance Analysis: Self-Study

Student Performance in Context	
In my classroom, do more students struggle with code-based or meaning-related skills, or do a large percentage struggle with both?	
What are the specific skills for which the largest proportion of students display risk?	
What are the specific skills for which the fewest students display risk?	
Who are the students who display risk in areas when most of their peers meet benchmarks?	
Who are the students who score far higher than their peers? In what skills?	

Analyzing Current Classroom Practice

Literacy Component	Current Time Spent Teaching	Materials	Teaching Methods and Instructional Routines	Needed Changes to Support Instructional Priority
Phonological awareness (for preschool through first grade)	Daily			
	Weekly			
Phonics and fluency	Daily			
	Weekly			
Comprehension strategies	Daily			
	Weekly			
Vocabulary	Daily			
	Weekly			

Maximizing Meaningful Learning Opportunities across the Day

Priority Area		
Setting	**Current Practices**	**Ideas for Intensifying**
Whole Class		
Small Groups		
Centers		
School to Home		

Data-Driven Instruction: Self-Evaluation Tool

Use the following rubric to evaluate your school on how well you are implementing data-driven instruction.

	1	2	3	4	5
Scheduling	Few teachers provide assessment results to school or district leaders	Many teachers do not complete the assessment battery in a timely fashion; scores are missing for several students, classrooms, and/or subtests	Most teachers complete testing in a timely fashion, although some are predictably late; or, data are missing on several students, particularly high-risk students (e.g., ELLs, special education, students with many absences)	All teachers complete testing in a timely fashion, although there is no system in place to catch absent students, resulting in missing information on some high-risk students (e.g., ELLs, special education, students with many absences)	All teachers complete testing in a timely fashion; every effort is made to ensure that all students are tested through a clear make-up system
Administration	Scores difficult to interpret due to inconsistencies in administration; may be administered by volunteer tutors, paraprofessionals, or others who have limited or no training in the measure, or teacher-led administration may reveal fears and mistrust	There is lingering confusion around testing procedures and/or scoring, resulting in nonstandard practice and some questionable scores	Some teachers do not administer assessments to their own students and may be completely unfamiliar with the measure; not all key staff have been trained in administration	Test administrators received training on testing procedures, but are not yet fully familiar and comfortable with measures	Test administrators clearly understand rules and follow standardized testing procedures; teachers administer formative assessments to their own students

	1	2	3	4	5
Reporting	Each teacher has his or her own way to report data; not all classrooms report the same scores; data not easily accessed by instructional leaders	Reporting systems vary by grade level and/or classroom and are not consistent throughout the school	There is a common system of reporting scores, although it is not consistently used by all teachers	Teachers use a common system of reporting scores, although it is not centrally organized and may be difficult to access	Teachers use a common system of reporting scores that are collected and organized in a central system
Assessment literacy	Teachers focus on literacy assessments as an evaluation tool resulting in fear and mistrust; some teachers may inflate scores to protect their professional image	Assessments seen solely as a vehicle for placing children in groups or identifying them as "above" or "below" grade level	Understanding of assessments varies by measure and by teacher, although there is limited discussion of the specific skills being measured	Most teachers have a general understanding of the assessments, although they may not be clear on how the specific skills being assessed fit into a comprehensive and balanced literacy block	Teachers understand what literacy components are measured and what results tell about students; they can translate results into teaching strategies that are evidence based
Data meetings	Data are not discussed	There is no system or schedule in place to discuss data, although there are pockets of professionals who discuss results	Some teachers meet regularly to discuss data, but data meetings are not consistent across the school; data meetings may be frequently canceled or dominated by more immediate issues	Regular meetings are scheduled to discuss student results, although the focus of the meetings are not systematic; meetings sometimes canceled or interrupted	Regular and systematic meetings are scheduled to discuss student results; meetings are considered "sacred"; meetings focus on instructional practice and intervention
Application	Assessment results are reported for compliance reasons only; no consideration of results is used in planning instruction	Teachers re-create assessment procedures as their main strategy of addressing results	Teachers use experience and intuition to modify instruction based on assessment results, with limited application to the literacy block or targeted interventions	Assessment results consistently used to form instructional groups, but results are not connected to evidence-based practices	Assessment results are used to strategically inform core instruction and intervention using evidence-based practices