



How NCTQ scores the Assessment and Data Standard

[Standard and indicators](#)

Data used to score this standard

Evaluation of elementary and secondary programs on Standard 12: Assessment and Data uses the following sources of data:

- Syllabi of relevant required courses
- Capstone projects—often called teacher work samples (TWS) or portfolios and including teacher performance assessments (TPAs)¹

Who analyzes the data

Two [general analysts](#) independently evaluate each elementary and secondary program using a detailed scoring protocol from which this scoring methodology is abstracted. For information on the process by which scoring discrepancies are resolved, see the “scoring processes” section of the [General Methodology](#).

Scope of Analysis

For elementary preparation programs, this analysis is based on evaluation of syllabi in required courses whose descriptions mention assessment² and the syllabus for any required math methods course if not already included. Syllabi of required literacy courses are excluded from analysis.³ For secondary preparation programs, analysis is based on evaluations of syllabi in required courses whose descriptions mention assessment, as well as the syllabus for the required methods course(s) in one core subject.⁴ In analysis of both elementary and secondary coursework, educational psychology courses taught in a psychology department and special education courses are excluded from analysis.⁵

¹ Analysts evaluate any assessment-related project assignments, whether these projects require candidates to submit artifacts from earlier coursework that reflect assessment assignments or entail new assessment assignments.

In **California**, **Minnesota** and **Washington**, the relevant TPA used in the state is utilized as a data source for all IHEs regardless of whether provided by the IHE because TPA initiatives are statewide. In **Tennessee** and **Ohio**, the relevant TPA used by the state is used as a data source for selected IHEs regardless of whether provided by the IHE if a state official indicated that the IHE has moved beyond isolated field tests to a full implementation. In all other states, a TPA is used as a data source only if provided by the IHE.

In many cases, the TPA used by the IHE is the “edTPA,” a proprietary instrument that NCTQ could not obtain in its entirety for a full evaluation. However, we were able to obtain a portion of the edTPA and compare it to the Stanford PACT (the edTPA’s precursor), and we were also able to confirm with a knowledgeable state education agency official that the edTPA does not substantively differ from the Stanford PACT in any of the features on which we base our evaluation.

In **Oregon**, the state’s required Teacher Work Sample is utilized as a data source.

² Terms in titles or coursework that are considered to indicate coverage of assessment are “assessment,” “measurement,” “evaluation,” “evaluate instruction,” “monitoring of student progress,” “evaluation of learning,” “analysis of outcomes” and “instructional planning tied to/ based on assessment.”

³ The more specialized types of assessment emphasized in literacy courses fulfill different purposes and require a more specialized evaluation than provided in this standard. An analysis of assessment in literacy courses is conducted as part of the evaluation of **Standard 2: Early Reading**.

⁴ To parallel the experience of secondary candidates, we examine a randomly selected pathway for certification (mathematics, the sciences, English, or the social sciences) and then evaluate the methods course for the pathway chosen, regardless of whether assessment is mentioned in the course’s title or description. The same pathway is used for our evaluation of **Standard 15: Secondary Methods**.

⁵ Treatment of assessment in educational psychology courses taught in a psychology department that are not designed for teachers are not sufficiently contextualized to K-12 schooling. Special education coursework requires a more specialized evaluation of assessment topics than provided here.

In both elementary and secondary programs, capstone projects are also evaluated. Thorough [document processing](#) ensures that capstone project descriptions and any other relevant sources of data from student teaching are isolated.

In both **undergraduate** and **graduate** programs, Indicator 12.1 is evaluated for reporting purpose (not scoring) using syllabus descriptions of course lecture topics and assigned reading (with course objectives and assignment descriptions providing context as necessary for interpretation). For evaluation of this indicator, references to the state’s standardized tests found in a non-pedagogical context (e.g., in a “Foundations of Education” course) do not satisfy the indicator.

Indicators 12.2 and 12.3 are evaluated for scoring purposes using assignments noted in syllabi and descriptions of capstone projects. Throughout the evaluation, evidence may be taken from several lectures or assignments within one course (and a capstone project, as relevant) as well as across several courses (and the capstone project, as relevant) in order to satisfy a particular indicator. ([More discussion of analysis using syllabi.](#))

Analysts are trained to take the broadest possible interpretation of assessment references and also to consider standard usage. For example, a reference to “accountability” in the context of a lecture on assessment is presumed to refer to the state’s standardized test system because this broad interpretation is justified. However, in the absence of any other description, a requirement that a teacher candidate develop an “authentic assessment” is presumed to satisfy the requirement that candidates develop summative assessments, not both formative and summative assessments, because “authentic assessment” most commonly is posed as an alternative to more traditional forms of summative assessment.

Due to the burden imposed by document processing and analysis, the full sample of programs in the first edition of the *Review* was not evaluated on this standard. Instead

of evaluating all programs for which any material had been provided by an IHE, we instead established a calendar deadline for analysis that would ensure that we could evaluate a sample of sufficient size to provide credible information about the nature of teacher preparation in this area. Once this deadline was established, we also prioritized evaluation of programs producing the largest number of teacher candidates each year. Programs were only removed from the sample if it was impossible to make a determination on one or more indicators due to a lack of clarity in data.

Common misconceptions about how analysts evaluate the Assessment and Data Standard:

- *Syllabi are the only data source considered in the standard’s evaluation.* Evaluation for this standard does beyond evaluation of syllabi to include culminating projects – which often contain the only assignments involving data analysis and interpretation required of teacher candidates.
- *Lectures addressing the preparation of classroom assessments and interpretation of assessment data can be used for evaluation of this standard.* Hearing about assessment isn’t sufficient to ensure that teacher candidates will enter the classroom with sufficient preparation: To receive credit, a program’s teacher candidates must engage in practice activities or assignments that result in tangible products.
- *Assessment related coursework in special education and literacy courses can be used for evaluation of this standard.* Instruction on the more specialized types of assessment in special education and literacy fulfills different purposes and requires a more specialized evaluation than provided in this standard. (An analysis of assessment in literacy courses *is* conducted as part of the evaluation of **Standard 2: Early Reading.**)

How a program earns a “strong design” rating

Evaluation for strong design under this standard entails examination of the structure of assessment-relevant coursework to determine if a core data literacy course is complemented by courses that address assessment through the lens of subject-specific pedagogy and include aligned field work.

Examples of what satisfies or does not satisfy the standard’s indicators

Instructional role of state’s standardized tests (Indicator 12.1)

✓ - fully satisfies the indicator (reported only)	✗ - does not satisfy the indicator (reported only)
<p>The program explicitly addresses the instructional role of standardized tests, particularly the program state’s standardized tests.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ <i>Lecture entitled “Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System.”</i>■ <i>Lecture on standardized testing with references to the role of assessment in light of No Child Left Behind legislation.</i>■ <i>Lecture entitled “Standardized Tests and Accountability.”</i>■ <i>Capstone project that requires teacher candidates to report and reflect on their school’s state testing data and progress toward Annual Yearly Progress (AYP).⁶</i>■ <i>Course objective outline that lists coverage of the North Carolina EOGs, and list of lecture topics that includes “Standardized Testing.”</i>■ <i>Assignment to analyze the Georgia Performance Standards for grades 6-8 in candidate’s primary and secondary certification areas, compare to expectations for student achievement on the CRCT and analyze how NCLB mandates affect instructional priorities.</i>	<p>The program does not explicitly address the instructional role of standardized tests, or it addresses standardized tests other than the state’s tests.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ <i>Lecture entitled “National and International Assessment Data.”</i>■ <i>Lecture entitled “Standardized Assessment” in an Educational Psychology course.</i>■ <i>Lecture entitled “Large scale tests, issues, and interpretation.”</i>

⁶ The specificity of this assignment (in its reference to “AYP”) allows the analyst to presume that instruction in coursework prepares the candidate on the topic of the state’s standardized tests even though no lecture on the topic was evident.

Preparation of formative and summative assessments (Indicator 12.2)

✓ - fully satisfies the indicator	✗ - does not satisfy the indicator
<p>The program requires teacher candidates to prepare both formative and summative assessments.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ <i>Teacher candidates prepare a unit plan using the Understanding by Design (UbD) framework.⁷</i>■ <i>Capstone project requires a full assessment plan, including a pre/post-test and several formative assessments.</i>■ <i>Assignment entitled Thematic Unit requires several unspecified assessments. (These are interpreted to include practice relevant to this indicator because the syllabus lists requirements that include the development of formative, summative and authentic assessments.)</i>	<p>The program requires the teacher candidate to prepare either formative or summative assessments (not both), or to prepare neither.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ <i>Teacher candidates are required to conduct an informal, formative interview to determine a student's baseline knowledge of fractions, but the course assignments do not include a follow-up inventory of knowledge gained post-instruction.</i>■ <i>Capstone project requires the use of formative and summative assessments; however, the assessments need not be prepared by the teacher candidate.</i>

⁷ Use of the UbD planning format presumes use of formative assessment; preparation of a unit plan is always presumed to entail preparation of a summative assessment.

Individual and team analysis and interpretation of data (Indicator 12.3)

Note that this indicator requires that teacher candidates work with both classroom and standardized assessment data, both individually *and* with their peers.

✓ - fully satisfies the indicator	~ - partly satisfies the indicator	✗ - does not satisfy the indicator
<p>The program requires teacher candidates, individually and in teams, to analyze and interpret classroom and standardized assessment data in order to inform instruction.</p> <p>Example:</p> <p><i>A course requires teacher candidates to bring in standardized and classroom assessment samples and data from their field classrooms for in-class analysis and discussion of instructional implications. The capstone project in the same program requires teacher candidates to conduct individual analyses of classroom and standardized assessment data as well as reflect on the instructional implications of those assessment results.</i></p>	<p>The program partly satisfies this indicator because teacher candidates do some combination that constitutes the majority of the activities required by this indicator.</p> <p>Example:</p> <p><i>A TWS requires that teacher candidates individually use classroom assessment data to analyze the impact of instruction on student learning “in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal.” It must also be evident that the teacher candidate used pre-assessment data to modify instruction and reflected on changes he or she might make in the future based on post-assessment data. Teacher candidates must present to their peers their classroom assessment data analysis and implications for future instruction for feedback and discussion.</i></p>	<p>The program does not satisfy this indicator because teacher candidates do none or only a few of the activities required by this indicator.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p><i>A program’s capstone project requires teacher candidates to individually analyze pre/post-classroom assessment data, modify instruction based on formative assessment results and discuss future instructional implications based on summative assessment data.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>A course’s field experience requirement includes a journal in which teacher candidates reflect on assessment strategies used and changes in student achievement in their field classroom.⁸</i></p>

⁸ Assignments counted as practice for Indicators 12.2 and 12.3 cannot simply involve a teacher candidate writing reflectively about assessments developed or assessment data analyzed; they must involve the tangible product of an assessment or the analysis itself, products that can be submitted for instructor review. However, an assignment involving a written reflection that specifically discusses the instructional implications of assessment data can be counted as a practice assignment even if there is no implementation of instruction.