NATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE CENTER
FOR TEACHER QUALITY

Linking Assessment and Instruction

Innovation Configuration

Authors

This innovation configuration was developed by John L. Hosp, Ph.D., University of Iowa.

Original Source

This innovation configuration originally appeared in the following resource, which fully describes the innovation configuration, clarifies its purpose, and provides examples of what each component may look like in the classroom.

Hosp, J. L. (2010). *Linking assessment and instruction: Teacher preparation and professional development* (TQ Connection Issue Paper). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved May 12, 2011, from http://www.tqsource.org/pdfs/TQ_IssuePaper_AssessInstruct.pdf

Instructions for Using Innovation Configurations

The following resource describes the content and purpose of innovation configurations, outlines their intended use as syllabus evaluation tools, and provides scoring guidelines and examples for clarification.

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. (2011). *Innovation configurations: Guidelines for use in institutions of higher education and professional development evaluation.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved May 12, 2011, from http://www.tqsource.org/publications/IC_Guidelines.pdf

Introduction

This innovation configuration identifies the skills and competencies teachers need to make sound decisions about using assessment information to improve instruction and establishes a framework and justification for effective ways that teachers can collect and use assessment data to make instructional decisions. It is designed to provide a blueprint for preservice teacher preparation; however, it also may be used as an evaluation rubric or development guide for inservice professional development.

Essential Components	Variations					
	Code = 0	Code = 1	Code = 2	Code = 3	Code = 4	Rating
Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria specified, from 0 to 4. Score and rate each item separately. Descriptors and examples are bulleted below each of the components.	**There is no evidence** that the component is included in the class syllabus.	Syllabus mentions **content related to the component**.	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings and tests or quizzes**.	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings, tests or quizzes, and assignments or projects for application.** • Observations • Lesson plans • Classroom demonstration • Journal response	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings, tests or quizzes, assignments or projects, and teaching with application and feedback.** • Fieldwork (practicum) • Tutoring	Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.
Standards for Comparison of Performance • Norm referenced (i.e., comparison to age- or grade-similar peers) • Criterion referenced (i.e., comparison to empirically derived level of proficiency) • Ispative standards (i.e., comparison to prior performance)						
Considerations for Decision Making • Usage of and differentiation between the terms *assessment* and *evaluation* • Comparisons of inside and outside purposes of decision making • Definitions and comparisons between summative and formative evaluation (and possibly interim assessments) • Use of structured decision-making frameworks (e.g., curriculum-based evaluation)						

Essential Components	Variations					Rating
	Code = 0	Code = 1	Code = 2	Code = 3	Code = 4	Rating
Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria specified, from 0 to 4. Score and rate each item separately. Descriptors and examples are bulleted below each of the components.	**There is no evidence** that the component is included in the class syllabus.	Syllabus mentions **content related to the component**.	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings and tests or quizzes**.	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings, tests or quizzes, and assignments or projects for application.** • Observations • Lesson plans • Classroom demonstration • Journal response	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings, tests or quizzes, assignments or projects, and teaching with application and feedback.** • Fieldwork (practicum) • Tutoring	Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.
Identification of Student Response • Characteristics of good formative measures • Ease of administration and scoring • Representation of performance with graphs • Aggregation of data to make individual or small-group, classwide, and schoolwide or districtwide decisions • Standards for comparison of performance • Norms • Benchmarks • Prior progress						

Linking Assessment and Instruction Innovation Configuration

Essential Components	Variations					Rating
	Code = 0	Code = 1	Code = 2	Code = 3	Code = 4	Rating
Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria specified, from 0 to 4. Score and rate each item separately. Descriptors and examples are bulleted below each of the components.	**There is no evidence** that the component is included in the class syllabus.	Syllabus mentions **content related to the component**.	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings and tests or quizzes**.	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings, tests or quizzes, and assignments or projects for application.** • Observations • Lesson plans • Classroom demonstration • Journal response	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings, tests or quizzes, assignments or projects, and teaching with application and feedback.** • Fieldwork (practicum) • Tutoring	Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.
Fundamentals of Assessment Reliability—definition and types commonly used to judge educational assessments (e.g., test-retest, interrater) • Validity—definition and types commonly used to judge educational assessments (e.g., criterion-related, content) • Use and interpretation of score scales (e.g., percentiles, standard scores, systematic observation metrics) • Legal provisions of assessment (e.g., ESEA, IDEA) • Issues of cultural and linguistic bias and fairness • Accommodations and modifications for students with disabilities or English learners • Types of educational decisions for which assessment data can be collected to help in decision making (i.e., screening, progress, broad and targeted diagnostic, and outcome)						

Essential Components	Variations					Rating
	Code = 0	Code = 1	Code = 2	Code = 3	Code = 4	Rating
Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria specified, from 0 to 4. Score and rate each item separately. Descriptors and examples are bulleted below each of the components.	**There is no evidence** that the component is included in the class syllabus.	Syllabus mentions **content related to the component**.	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings and tests or quizzes**.	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings, tests or quizzes, and assignments or projects for application.** • Observations • Lesson plans • Classroom demonstration • Journal response	Syllabus mentions the component and requires **readings, tests or quizzes, assignments or projects, and teaching with application and feedback.** • Fieldwork (practicum) • Tutoring	Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.
Assessment Procedures • Review of prior records • Interview with relevant individuals • Observation of performance in appropriate settings • Administration and interpretation of test results • Selection of assessment procedures that provide the information needed to make instructional decisions						
Identification of Content to Teach • Consideration of and focus on broad areas (e.g., reading, mathematics) • Consideration and focus on specific subskills, important prerequisites, or related skills (e.g., phonological segmenting, understanding of place value) • Addressing alignment of assessment or instruction on different forms of knowledge (i.e., facts, concepts, strategies) • Working within the instructional hierarchy: accuracy, fluency, generalization, adaptation • Consideration of difficulties arising from skill deficits or performance deficits • Alignment with or writing of goals and objectives • Analysis of student work						

About the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality

The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (TQ Center) was created to serve as the national resource to which the regional comprehensive centers, states, and other education stakeholders turn for strengthening the quality of teaching—especially in high-poverty, low-performing, and hard-to-staff schools—and for finding guidance in addressing specific needs, thereby ensuring that highly qualified teachers are serving students with special needs.

The TQ Center is funded by the U.S. Department of Education and is a collaborative effort of ETS, Learning Point Associates, and Vanderbilt University. Integral to the TQ Center's charge is the provision of timely and relevant resources to build the capacity of regional comprehensive centers and states to effectively implement state policy and practice by ensuring that all teachers meet the federal teacher requirements of the current provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act.

The TQ Center is part of the U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Centers program, which includes 16 regional comprehensive centers that provide technical assistance to states within a specified boundary and five content centers that provide expert assistance to benefit states and districts nationwide on key issues related to current provisions of ESEA.

LEARNING POINT Associates®
An Affiliate of American Institutes for Research®

ETS®

VANDERBILT®