

STANDARD

8

An excellent Catholic school uses school-wide assessment methods and practices to document student learning and program effectiveness, to make student performances transparent, and to inform the continuous review of the curriculum and the improvement of instructional practices.

Benchmark 8.1: School-wide and student data are used to inform, review, and evaluate the curriculum, co-curricular programs, ancillary services, sustained student growth, and faculty performance.

LEVEL 4
Exceeds
Benchmark

By design throughout the school year, all teachers and the school use **a robust variety** of school-wide and student data to inform, review, and evaluate the curriculum, co-curricular programs, ancillary services, sustained student growth, and faculty performance.

Faculty and staff are engaged in robust assessment of co-curricular programs and ancillary services, including peer and self-assessment.

LEVEL 3
Fully Meets
Benchmark

School-wide and student data are regularly used to inform, review, and evaluate the curriculum, co-curricular programs, ancillary services, sustained student growth, and faculty performance.

LEVEL 2
Partially Meets
Benchmark

School-wide and student data are generated by one or two tools and **are sometimes in some subject areas** used to inform, review, and/or evaluate the curriculum and/or co-curricular programs and/or ancillary services.

Student growth is minimally addressed.

Data are **minimally used or not used** to monitor or assess faculty performance.

LEVEL 1
Does Not Meet
Benchmark

School-wide and student data are **not systematically generated** or are generated but **not used** to inform, review, or evaluate the curriculum, co-curricular programs, and ancillary services.

Student growth is not shared and reviewed by faculty.

Data are **rarely used or not used at all** to monitor or assess faculty performance.

**Possible Sources
of Evidence**

- Faculty performance reviews including remediation, accolades, etc. tied to growth in student academics and well-being
- Standardized test data
- Classroom assessment data
- Student growth data
- Analysis of student growth data connected to teacher of record
- Data for co-curricular programs
- Data for ancillary services
- Co-curricular evaluations
- Awards connected to co-curricular programs (student scholarships for music performance, debate, athletics, etc.)
- Curriculum evaluations
- Growth planning templates
- PLC decisions, meeting agendas, and minutes

STANDARD

8

An excellent Catholic school uses school-wide assessment methods and practices to document student learning and program effectiveness, to make student performances transparent, and to inform the continuous review of the curriculum and the improvement of instructional practices.

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

LEVEL 4
Exceeds
Benchmark

School-wide and aggregated student data are normed to appropriate populations. These data are **consistently** shared with all stakeholders **in a clear, effective manner to be most transparent.**

LEVEL 3
Fully Meets
Benchmark

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

LEVEL 2
Partially Meets
Benchmark

School-wide and aggregated student data are **sometimes but not consistently** normed to appropriate populations.

School-wide and aggregated student data are **sometimes but not consistently shared** with all stakeholders.

LEVEL 1
Does Not Meet
Benchmark

School-wide and aggregated student data are **not** normed to appropriate populations and/or are **not shared** with all stakeholders.

Possible Sources
of Evidence

- Newsletters
- Standardized test data
- Data from similar populations
- School website
- Communication with families, parish(es), invested community members, and supporters of Catholic schools, etc.
- Communication with the board
- Marketing materials
- Newspaper articles
- Information in various forms of media—websites, television, parish bulletins, journals, and magazines, etc.
- Electronic communications concerning student data

STANDARD

8

An excellent Catholic school uses school-wide assessment methods and practices to document student learning and program effectiveness, to make student performances transparent, and to inform the continuous review of the curriculum and the improvement of instructional practices.

Benchmark 8.3: Faculty use a variety of curriculum-based assessments aligned with learning outcomes and instructional practices to assess student learning and to plan for continued and sustained student growth.

LEVEL 4
Exceeds
Benchmark

By design in all subject areas, faculty use a variety of curriculum-based assessments aligned with learning outcomes and instructional practices to assess student learning and to plan for continued and sustained student growth.

These assessments **may include but are not limited** to formative, summative, authentic performance, and student self-assessment.

Faculty **in every classroom adjust instructional practices** based on data from assessments. Assessments are reviewed and re-evaluated regularly using a consistent schedule to ensure they are reliable, valid, aligned to mission, and culturally responsive.

LEVEL 3
Fully Meets
Benchmark

Faculty use a variety of curriculum-based assessments aligned with learning outcomes and instructional practices to assess student learning and plan for continued and sustained student growth.

These assessments **include but are not limited** to formative, summative, authentic performance, and student self-assessment.

Faculty **adjust instructional practices** based on data from assessments. For example, when many students struggle on an assessment, the teacher reteaches, provides small-group instruction, or provides appropriate differentiation.

LEVEL 2
Partially Meets
Benchmark

Faculty use a **limited** variety of curriculum-based assessments that **may be** aligned with learning outcomes **and/or** instructional practices to assess student learning.

Faculty **sometimes adjust** instructional practices based on data from assessments.

LEVEL 1
Does Not Meet
Benchmark

In general, faculty **do not use** a variety of curriculum-based assessments aligned with learning outcomes to assess student learning or plan for student growth.

Possible Sources
of Evidence

- Assessments
- Curriculum guides
- Crosswalk/Comparative Analysis for assessments and curriculum guides, and/or assessments and instructional practices for purposes of alignment
- Faculty analysis of data related to curriculum
- Instructional planning documents, indicating how assessment results are used in planning. For example, small-group or differentiated instruction is designed based on data from universal screeners or previous assessments.
- PLC meeting notes
- Assessment planning documents
- Curriculum maps



STANDARD

8

An excellent Catholic school uses school-wide assessment methods and practices to document student learning and program effectiveness, to make student performances transparent, and to inform the continuous review of the curriculum and the improvement of instructional practices.

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

LEVEL 4
Exceeds
Benchmark

By design in every classroom, criteria used to evaluate student work and the reporting mechanisms are valid, consistent, transparent, equitable, and justly administered.

Faculty meet regularly to ensure validity and equity of assessments. In the case of common assessments, faculty also build inter-rater reliability of assessments.

Criteria are aligned to evidence-based best practices, the school's written curriculum, and discipline-based professional standards (e.g., NCTM, NCTE, etc.).

Parents and students understand and have transparent and equitable access to the criteria (e.g., home language, paper and electronically, etc.) at the outset of the assignment.

Teachers elicit student feedback.

LEVEL 3
Fully Meets
Benchmark

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

Faculty collaborate to develop school-wide criteria for valid and equitable assessment of students.

Criteria are based on evidence-based best practices and discipline-based professional standards (e.g., NCTM, NCTE, etc.).

Parents and students understand the criteria and have equitable, transparent access to criteria (for example, in-home language, offered via paper and electronically, etc.) at the outset of the assignment.

LEVEL 2
Partially Meets
Benchmark

Teachers use criteria to evaluate student work and **make an effort** to communicate the criteria to students and parents.

There is **occasional** school-wide collaboration to ensure that the criteria and the mechanisms for reporting are valid, consistent, transparent, equitable, and justly administered across teachers and classrooms.

LEVEL 1
Does Not Meet
Benchmark

Teachers are **not communicating criteria** used to evaluate students.

Little or no effort is made to determine whether the reporting mechanisms are valid, consistent, transparent, equitable, **and/or** justly administered across teachers and classrooms.

Possible Sources
of Evidence

- Rubrics, grading checklists aligned with curriculum and accessible to families (e.g., language, internet accessibility, paper, and electronic versions, etc.)
- Web-based grade reporting
- Assessments aligned with the curriculum
- Criteria for evaluation distributed when assignments are given
- Verification and/or citations for validity of criteria
- PLC meeting notes
- Feedback from parents and students

STANDARD

8

An excellent Catholic school uses school-wide assessment methods and practices to document student learning and program effectiveness, to make student performances transparent, and to inform the continuous review of the curriculum and the improvement of instructional practices.

Benchmark 8.5: Faculty use student data to inform the work of their professional learning communities; such data are collected and used to monitor individual and class-wide student learning and to set goals for the professional learning community.

LEVEL 4
Exceeds
Benchmark

All faculty **by design** use student data to inform the work of their professional learning communities which meet regularly and intentionally; such data are collected and used to monitor **and improve** individual and class-wide student learning and to set goals for the professional learning communities (PLCs).

PLCs **routinely** use student data to revise and adjust curriculum and instruction.

LEVEL 3
Fully Meets
Benchmark

Faculty use student data to inform the work of their professional learning communities; such data are collected and used to monitor individual and class-wide student learning and to set goals for the professional learning community which meets regularly.

PLCs **use student data** to revise and adjust curriculum and instruction.

LEVEL 2
Partially Meets
Benchmark

Some faculty **may** use student data to inform their instruction and set individual goals for student growth.

These teachers may share that work with their teams/ departments **but** the teams/departments **do not** function like PLCs, setting shared goals for student growth based on the data.

LEVEL 1
Does Not Meet
Benchmark

Faculty **do not** use student data to inform their own instruction and/or to set individual goals for student growth.

PLCs **do not exist**.

Possible Sources
of Evidence

- PLC rosters
- Minutes or notes from PLC meetings
- PLC meeting schedule
- PLC goals and objectives
- PLC S.M.A.R.T./S.M.A.R.T.E.R. goals and record of demonstrated achievement
- Common assessments
- Common rubrics
- Curriculum maps