Elementary Data Teams Monitoring Tool

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Structure | | | |
| School: Grade Level: Time Frame: 🞏 Literacy 🞏 Math  Teachers in attendance/Role: | | | |
|  | | | |
| **Indicators of Collaboration:**   * Team operates under developed norms. * All members openly reflect upon their own instructional practices. * All members share ideas, successes and challenges. * All members adhere to meeting time and purpose. * All members bring required resources to meeting. | | **Performance Level:**  **Level 4:** All teachers are contributing members of the PLC and add to the professional and respectful environment. When applicable, all indicators listed were observed.  **Level 3:** Teachers engage in the PLC process. 3-4 of the indicators listed were observed.  **Level 2:** Teachers engage in the PLC process. 1-2 of the indicators listed were observed.  **Level 1:** Teachers engage in PLC but no indicators were observed. | |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **\*\*Determine which step in the Data Teams process teams are completing and use that column of indicators only.** | | | | |
| **Step 1:**  **Focusing our Instruction** | **Step 2:**  **CFA Creation** | | **Steps 3-5:**  **Analyzing CFA Data** | |
| **Literacy:**   * Members identify a common interpretation of the standard(s) through the creation of their “Team I Can” statements. * The rigor of each standard is maintained during the creation of “Team I Can” statements. * Previous instruction and student needs are discussed while creating the “Team I Can” statements. | **Literacy**:   * “Team I Can” statements are used to design assessment questions. * The assessment format is determined based upon the demands of the standard(s). * Members agree upon what constitutes proficiency for each question. * Administration logistics (who, when, where) are decided. There is evidence of link to the Data Teams cycle. | | Step 3:   * Goals are SMART. * Goals are reviewed and adjusted as needed.   Step 4:   * The inferring of strengths and needs are based on direct analysis of student work. * Strengths and needs identified are within the direct influence of teachers. * Team goes beyond labeling the need, or the “what,” to infer the root cause or the “why”. * Clear use of standards and learner objectives during analysis of student work.   Step 5:   * Strategies directly target the needs identified during the analysis. * Strategies chosen will modify teachers’ instructional practice. * Strategies describe actions of adults that change the thinking of students. * Descriptions of strategies are specific enough to allow for replication (i.e. implementation, frequency, duration, resources). | |
| **Math**: Not Applicable | **Math**:   * All “I Can” statements are represented on the Pre-Assessment. * Members agree upon which questions from the district assessment would be beneficial for use. * Administration logistics (who, when, where) are decided. There is evidence of link to the Data Teams cycle. | |
| **Performance Level** | **Performance Level** | | **Performance Level** | |
| **Level 4:** All members actively contribute to the construction of the “Team I Can” statements. When applicable, all indicators listed were observed.  **Level 3:** Members construct the “Team I Can” statements. When applicable, 2 of the indicators listed were observed.  **Level 2:** Individuals construct the “Team I Can” statements. When applicable, 1 of the indicators listed was observed.  **Level 1:** Teachers engage in the PLC but no indicators were observed. | **Level 4:** All members actively contribute to the construction of the assessment. When applicable, all indicators listed were observed.  **Level 3:** Members construct the assessment. When applicable, 2-3 of the indicators listed were observed.  **Level 2:** Individuals construct the assessment. When applicable, 1-2 of the indicators listed were observed.  **Level 1:** Teachers engage in the PLC but no indicators were observed. | | **Level 4:** All teachers leave DT meeting with clear actions for instruction. Instruction was designed based upon student progress towards content standards. 9-10 indicators listed were observed.  **Level 3:** Teachers engage in data analysis practices that support planning for instruction. 7-8 of the indicators listed were observed.  **Level 2:** Teachers engage in data analysis practices that support planning for instruction. 5-6 of the indicators listed were observed.  **Level 1:** 0-4 indicators were observed. | |
| Notes: | Notes: | | Notes: | |