| Core Function | Curriculum, Assessment, and Instructional Planning | Effective Practice | Engage Instructional Teams in assessing and monitoring student mastery |

Indicator: Unit pre-test and post-test results are reviewed by the Instructional Team. (5113)

Explanation: Other indicators describe pre-tests and post-tests as formative assessments developed by Instructional Teams that teachers use to get a quick reading on students' varying readiness for a new lesson or unit and then show progress by the end of the lesson or unit. The pre-test enables the teacher to adjust the lessons and to differentiate the assignments. By reviewing these data, the teachers on and Instructional Team can compare their strategies and determine what worked best. They can also modify their units and the formative assessments.

Questions: Do your Instructional Teams review data from unit pre-tests and post-tests to check on student progress, compare results, share strategies, and modify their instructional plans?

In an effective system, teachers, working in teams, build the taught curriculum from learning standards, curriculum guides, and a variety of resources, including textbooks, other commercial materials, and teacher-created activities and materials. Instructional Teams organize the curriculum into unit plans that guide instruction for all students and for each student. The unit plans assure that students master standards-based objectives and also provide opportunities for enhanced learning. A unit of instruction is typically three to six weeks of work within a subject area for a particular grade level or course sequence. To pool teacher expertise and secure a guaranteed, taught curriculum, an Instructional Team can develop a plan for each unit. The plan is shared by all the teachers who teach that subject and grade level. The alignment process serves two related purposes: It serves as a check on guide/text/test congruence, and it provides teachers with an organizational structure for their own planning (Glatthorn, 1995).

The unit plan is developed by the Instructional Team to define a unit of instruction and outline the standards and target objectives (typically grade level) addressed in the unit of instruction. The Instructional Team: (1) determines the concepts, principles, and skills that will be covered within the unit; (2) identifies the standards/benchmarks that apply to the grade level and unit topic; (3) develops all objectives that clearly align to the selected standards/benchmarks; (4) arranges the objectives in sequential order; (5) determines the best objective descriptors; (6) considers the most appropriate elements for mastery and constructs criteria for mastery; and (7) develops pre/post-test items that are clear and specific and would provide evidence of mastery consistent with the criteria established (Redding 2007).

In the Virginia Department of Education's *Guiding Questions Regarding Teacher Leader Training*, under Rapid Improvement Indicators, the Indicators are Instructional Teams, Professional Development, Aligned Instruction, Classroom Assessment, Differentiated Instruction, Periodic Assessment, Instructional Preparation, Classroom Management, Instructional Delivery, and Teacher–Student Interaction. The five units under Classroom Assessment are:

• Units of instruction include pre-/post-tests to assess student mastery of standards-based objectives.

- Unit pre-tests and post-tests are administered to all students in the grade level and subject covered by the unit of instruction.

- Unit pre-test and post-test results are reviewed by the Instructional Team.

- Teachers individualize instruction based on pre-test results to provide support for some students and enhanced learning opportunities for others.

- Teachers re-teach based on post-test results.

This iterative process has the Instructional Team's review of the pre- and post-testing as a vital link. Then, for example, at Milton Elementary School, " A Leadership Team consisting of the principal, teachers who lead the Instructional Teams, and other key professional staff meets regularly (twice a month for more than an hour each meeting)…. Instructional Teams meet for blocks of time sufficient to develop and refine units of instruction and review student learning data.... Instructional Teams use student learning data to assess strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and instructional strategies.... Instructional Teams review the results of unit pre-/post-tests to make decisions about the curriculum and instructional plans and to target students in need of intervention (both students in need of tutoring or extra help and students needing enhanced learning opportunities because of their early mastery of objectives)…. Every instructional team has a flowchart of the process for use of pre/post tests and decisions based on them. Each student's performance is reevaluated periodically. Instructional groups based on goals. All students receive support at appropriate instructional level. Pre-tests and post-test may be the same measure to save time and true comparison. Tasks: (1) By November 1, 2013 the leadership team will use data to determine instructional groups. Monitor effectiveness by reports of greater attention to students' needs and interventions more effective. (2) By June 30, 2014, leadership team will develop pre-tests that measure post-test results. Effectiveness monitored by identification of appropriate interventions or enrichment. Post data shows growth. (3) By October 1, 2014 leadership team will identify name for pretests. Effectiveness will be monitored by showing that student voice in naming will motivate students doing their best and pre-tests help identify students' needs…. Instructional Teams review the results of unit pre-/post-tests to make decisions about the curriculum and instructional

plans and to target students in need of intervention (both students in need of tutoring or extra help and students needing enhanced learning opportunities because of their early mastery of objectives)…. Effectiveness will be monitored by showing that student voice in naming will motivate students doing their best and pre-tests help identify students' needs" (Milton Elementary School, 2013).

For Special Education

 Score and analyze student pre-assessments/post-assessments individually or with colleagues in grade-level or course-specific instructional data teams to diagnose student learning needs. Use the results of pre-tests and post-tests to more accurately describe present levels of academic performance and/or functional performance for students with disabilities. Set a SMART goal representing the desired improvement of student performance to be achieved and demonstrated on the end-of-unit post-assessment (Ainsworth, 2011).

Vernier (2012) found "In today's society, many general education and special education teachers struggle with the concept of inclusion of students with intellectual disabilities (ID) in the general education classroom setting and perceive that inclusion of ID students impedes the learning of others. The purpose of this project was to establish if a 60-min training session on the benefits of inclusion would alter teachers' perceptions of inclusion of children with ID in the general education setting as measured by a pre- and post-training rating scale. Forty-eight general education and special education school teachers participated. Of the 48 participants, 47 had special education experience and 33 had students with ID in their classroom this calendar school year. I developed and delivered a 60-min training module describing benefits of inclusion for students and ways that teachers can actively involve students with ID in general education classrooms. Differences in pre- and post-test scores determined whether participants altered their perception of inclusion. The results from the data I collected on the pre- and post-tests showed that inclusion training did alter teacher's perceptions of inclusion. On average, 51.36% of the general educators' ratings of statements changed from pre-test to post-test, and 42.88% of the special educator's ratings of statements changed from the pre-test to the post-test. Of the 22 general education participants, 93% of the changed ratings to the

statements from pre-test to post-test were favorable to inclusion, while 7% were unfavorable to inclusion. Of the 26 special education participants, 91% of the changed ratings to the statements from pre-test to post-test were favorable to inclusion, and 9% were unfavorable to inclusion. Implications of my findings show that a 60-min inclusion training for educators is effective and can alter teacher's previous perceptions of the benefits of inclusion for all students" (Vernier, 2012).

References and Resources

Ainsworth, L. (2011). *Rigorous Curriculum Design*. The Leadership and Learning Center.

Glatthorn, A. (1995). *Developing a quality curriculum*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Milton Elementary School. (2013). *Crosswalk for Milton School District–Milton Elementary School.* Focus Turnaround Principles/Restructuring Plan/Steps to Success/SWIFT. Milton, NH: Author.

Redding, S. (2007). Systems for improved teaching and learning. In H. Walberg (Ed.), *Handbook on restructuring and substantial school improvement* (pp. 91–104). Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation and Improvement. Retrieved from www.adi.org.

Vernier, K. M. (2012). *The Effects of Training on Teachers' Perceptions of Inclusion of Students with Intellectual Disabilities.* All Graduate Plan B and other Reports, Paper 107. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/107/