



**Lessons Learned: Implementing and Improving Comprehensive and
Balanced Learning and Assessment Systems in High School
A Report for State Education Leaders**

Final Report from the Delaware Enhanced Assessment Grant

2009

**Council of Chief State School Officers
Washington, DC**

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nonpartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO provides leadership, advocacy, and technical assistance on major educational issues. The Council seeks member consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public.

The Delaware Enhanced Assessment Grant project was funded by the U.S. Department of Education in 2006 as an initiative to assist ten state department of education teams, and local school district and high school teams, in implementing a comprehensive and balanced learning and assessment system with a strong emphasis on a formative classroom assessment component. Along with the states, project partners included the Council of Chief State School Officers, Educational Testing Service, Edvantia, Inc., and the Center for Policy Research in Education.

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

T. Kenneth James (Arkansas), President
Rick Melmer (South Dakota), Past- President
Susan Gendron (Maine), President-Elect

Gene Wilhoit, Executive Director

Rolf K. Blank, Director of Education Indicators

Council of Chief State School Officers
Attn: Publications
One Massachusetts Ave., NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001
202-336-7016
Fax: 202-408-8072
www.ccsso.org

**Lessons Learned: Implementing and Improving Comprehensive and
Balanced Learning and Assessment Systems in High School—
A Report for State Education Leaders**

Final Report from the Delaware Enhanced Assessment Grant

March 2009

**Report prepared by:
Douglas Rindone, CCSSO Consultant &
Project Leadership Team**

**Consortium of States: Delaware, Arizona, Connecticut, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine,
Michigan, Nebraska, North Carolina, Virginia**

The project was funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education.

**Council of Chief State School Officers
Washington, DC
www.ccsso.org**

Acknowledgements

Project Leadership team:

Wendy Pickett, Delaware
Jim Hertzog, Delaware
Rolf Blank, CCSSO
Doris Redfield, Edvantia
Steven Chappuis, ETS
Rick Stiggins, ETS
Douglas Rindone, Project Consultant
Adam Petermann, CCSSO
Rhea Steele, CCSSO
Elliot Weinbaum, CPRE

State Project Leaders:

Chris	Paulino	Arizona Department of Education
Barbara	Beaudin	Connecticut Department of Education
Wendy	Roberts	Delaware Department of Education
Colleen	Anderson	Iowa Department of Education
Scott	Norton	Louisiana Department of Education
Shannon	Gregoire	Louisiana Department of Education
Angela	Faherty	Maine Department of Education
Kimberly	Young	Michigan Department of Education
Sarah	McManus	North Carolina Dept. of Public Instruction
Pat	Roschewski	Nebraska Department of Education
Patricia	Dalton	Virginia Department of Education

Report available online

http://www.ccsso.org/projects/scass/projects/formative_assessment_for_students_and_teachers/1541.cfm

The Delaware Enhanced Assessment Grant (DE EAG) project was funded by the U.S. Department of Education in 2006 as an initiative to assist 10 state departments of education (SDE) teams, and local school district and high school teams, in implementing a comprehensive and balanced learning and assessment system (CBAS) with a strong emphasis on a formative classroom assessment component. Along with the states, project partners included the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), Educational Testing Service, Edvantia, Inc., and the Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE). Results of the project provide an empirically-tested “road map” for states, districts, and schools, particularly high schools, in the implementation of formative classroom assessment that aligns with other components of the state’s learning and assessment system.

Consortium Project Goals

A goal of the DE EAG project was to use a cost-effective model of professional and leadership development designed to create sustainable and stand-alone “learning communities.” The purpose of these communities was to develop state leadership capacity for comprehensive and balanced assessment and instill this capacity in a few local district and high school teams in their respective states. The target date for the district and high school learning communities to begin discussing, implementing, and using classroom formative assessment was during the 2007-2008 school year. The project partnered with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to provide training in learning team development/facilitation and formative classroom assessment to state and high school learning teams. ETS refers to this training as “Leading Professional Development.” The ten states and project partners were involved in four kinds of activities as a consortium and within each member state beginning fall 2006 and continuing through fall 2008:

- ✚ Develop knowledge and understanding of a “comprehensive and balanced learning and assessment system” in state leader teams representing each of the Consortium states;
- ✚ Provide expert training for leader teams on balanced assessment system and building skills and knowledge of classroom assessment practices with a focus on formative assessment
- ✚ Establish a plan for implementing assessments for learning in a sample of high schools based on common materials and leader training.
- ✚ Based on experience and evidence, disseminate plans for broader implementation of balanced assessment systems and effective practices.

As the DE EAG prime contractor, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) conducted a “lessons learned” survey of the participating states to provide project leaders and the federal government with increased understanding of the issues associated with providing large scale professional development and dissemination. The survey was not meant to be an evaluation of the project, which has been conducted and completed by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE), University of Pennsylvania. Instead, this document provides a synopsis of current state status relative to each project goal and summarizes some of the implementation lessons learned by state participants.

Goal 1

Develop and implement a practitioner- and research-based vision of a comprehensive and balanced assessment system.

The intent of this goal was for each of the ten participating states to conduct self-examinations of their assessment program and determine how to design and integrate high-quality formative classroom assessment into a comprehensive and balanced assessment system (CBAS). Each state was charged with creating a clear vision statement or other document(s) to clarify the balanced nature of its assessment system and advancing the notion that an educational assessment system is in balance when it integrates classroom, interim/benchmark, and accountability assessments into a unified process that benefits learning.

Major activities associated with Goal 1 were:

1. November 2006 – Educational Testing Service (ETS) conducted an on-line workshop on balanced assessment systems for the DE EAG participating state teams. Each state team reviewed the ETS materials on balanced assessments in preparation for a December 2006 meeting and considered what a balanced assessment system might look like in their state.
2. December 2006 – The participating state teams met in St. Louis for training in classroom formative assessment (i.e., “*assessment for learning*”); to share plans for recruiting high school participants in the project; and to continue discussions and work on balanced assessment systems.
3. Each participating state recruited two or three volunteer high schools to participate in their state’s project.

Table 1. Synopsis of state progress in achieving Goal 1

Arizona	Arizona has created, within the Assessment and Accountability Division, a Formative Assessment Section with responsibility to provide statewide professional development on CBAS. It is through CBAS trainings and workshops that formative assessment as a process is addressed, the interim benchmark assessments and their role in CBAS is discussed, and how a well designed, well planned CBAS leads to increased student achievement. The State also maintains a website that is available to all certified personnel in the State of Arizona. Through this website certified personnel have access to professional development on CBAS, formative assessment, criterion referenced tests, norm referenced tests as well as access to item banks, benchmarks, and research based literature on formative assessment attributes and CBAS.
Connecticut	To help to focus discussions statewide, Connecticut developed a concept paper, “ <i>Connecticut’s Initiative to Support a Comprehensive Assessment System: Guidelines for Implementing Formative Assessment at the District Level.</i> ” Currently, leaders have begun to make statewide presentations

	regarding this concept.
Delaware	Delaware has two stakeholder groups: <i>the Assessment Task Force</i> and <i>the Vision 2015 committee</i> , which are addressing the question of a comprehensive and balanced assessment system in the state. A vision statement has been completed; budgetary and technology constraints, school readiness, and statewide leadership changes may limit full implementation. A statewide assessment request for proposals and subsequent implementation of a new comprehensive assessment system will further this agenda.
Iowa	Iowa addressed the issue of CBAS through its mandated statewide professional development program. It considers CBAS to be an important characteristic of a learning system which is emphasized in the IA Professional Development model.
Louisiana	The Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) clearly recognizes the need to communicate the idea of a balanced assessment system more effectively to educators across the state. Helping teachers connect their instruction and assessments practices with the state accountability assessments is a top goal. Some educators do not see the importance of linking their classroom instruction and assessment practices to the state's standards and assessments.
Maine	Maine developed a stakeholder policy statement regarding CBAS which is pending before the state legislature. This policy would impact both state and local agencies and begin to be implemented in 2010.
Michigan	A balanced assessment system was addressed in Michigan with a white paper titled "Overview of the Secondary Credit Assessment System". This white paper has been freely distributed, posted on the Secondary Credit Assessment System website, and presented at statewide assessment conferences.
North Carolina	A brochure was developed by Michigan to explain the need for a comprehensive balanced assessment system with a strong classroom formative assessment component. Professional development on the importance of formative assessment as an essential component of a balanced assessment system was conducted for internal staff and at various state conferences for district and school staff. When a Blue Ribbon Commission on Standards and Accountability made up of members from the NC General Assembly, business leaders, education experts, and local school staff was formed to study how to improve the state's standards, testing, and accountability programs, information was provided about the need for a balanced assessment system. As a result of the Blue Ribbon Commission, the State Board of Education developed a vision document titled "Framework for Change" that addresses standards, assessment and accountability using multiple measures, including formative assessment.
Nebraska	Through its STARS program, Nebraska had a balanced system in place prior to participation in this grant. However, new state legislation has mandated statewide uniform testing. The state department of education is

	communicating to districts through a variety of materials how all tests, i.e., state, national and local, can be used in a balanced way to inform instruction.
--	--

Goal 1 Lessons Learned

- The project States identified the importance of having funding and influential organizational partners support to get started with comprehensive and balanced assessment efforts in states.
- Working on such a broad and complex goal as comprehensive and balanced assessment systems was difficult, and it was important for as many levels of state and local government as possible to be involved (i.e., multilevel stakeholder groups).
- State education agency-wide commitment is needed to work on comprehensive and balanced assessments, otherwise the concept will only be “owned” by a few and it won’t be pursued in budget and action plans by other key stakeholders
- Assessment staff may be the most resistant to new broad approaches as tried in this project because of assessment overload, time constraints and lack of assessment staff involvement in the curriculum and instructional side of a balanced assessment system
- Improving learning is a broader commitment than just more testing. CBAS requires careful thought as to how the pieces will fit together at all levels.
- Building a comprehensive and balanced system requires a certain level of assessment literacy on the part of the leadership and managers at all levels. When that is missing, the system will be difficult to construct.

Note: This summary benefited from the findings of the project Evaluation Report (Weinbaum, 2008), as well as states reporting on what they learned.

Goal 2

Build state leadership capacity and support each state’s technical assistance to districts and high schools in providing high quality professional and leadership development in balanced assessment systems and specific practices of assessment for learning.

The intent of this goal was to develop supportive leaders, able to communicate the importance of classroom formative assessment and to facilitate and support the kinds of professional development that classroom teachers need to use assessment processes to help students learn.

The major activities provided under this goal were:

1. Training provided by ETS directly to the state leadership teams of 5-8 state department staff. This included Web Ex and live workshop presentations and discussions.
2. On-line professional “collaborative communities of learners and leaders” to enhance and sustain professional and leadership development within and across state teams.

Table 2. Synopsis of each state’s experiences working with the ETS “Leading Professional Development” training model as provided in the grant

Arizona	<p>Building state capacity was not an issue for Arizona since it has two staff dedicated entirely for formative assessment and the state office began to work quickly with two high school learning communities.</p> <p>Arizona built state capacity by training facilitators, technical educators, and instructional specialists at each site. One person from the State was dedicated to overseeing and participating in the cadres at each site and was responsible for overseeing the training of site personnel. Close contact was maintained between the State and district administration to keep all personnel apprised of status and to ensure quality participation of all teacher cadres. The online environment was the means by which the State delivered the ETS instructional materials and it continues to be a successful vehicle for the delivery of the program.</p>
Connecticut	<p>The state team benefited from the ETS training by participating as a collaborative across the curriculum/instruction bureau and the student assessment bureau within the Connecticut State Department of Education (SDE). As part of the training, a common lexicon for communicating about assessment issues in general and interim testing in specific was reinforced. Through face-to-face interactions and WebEx presentations, understanding of the intent and process of the Assessment For Learning system was increased and incorporated into SDE staff interactions and with DE EAG participating schools.</p> <p>Initially, Connecticut participants were active in the on-line collaborative communities’ site. State level users had access to posted documents as did</p>

	school level participants. There were some initial posts from district users. Interest and activity in this web site waned over time.
Delaware	The state team composition changed periodically due to shifts in assignments. Also, this was an “add on” project for staff that already had significant workloads. The ETS training materials and teaching each other as members of a learning community resulted in team cohesiveness. The community learning within the SDE contributed to the quality of training and explanations when working with teachers.
Iowa	The state cadre training model provided in the project worked well and Iowa continues to use that model and the expertise gained in its work with districts.
Louisiana	Louisiana elected to work with two chronically low-performing high schools. LDE staff learned that the school learning teams needed a lot of encouragement and support which included LDE’s hands-on presence at meetings and full participation in the “homework” assignments completed by team members. Face-to-face training in St. Louis provided direct experience and exhibited the benefit of “assessment for learning”-- the training was valuable, provided concrete examples, and modeled how to facilitate a small learning team. Over the course of the learning team process, school team members began to take more ownership of their own learning and were more likely to lead team meetings. Getting educators to engage in the online community of learners turned out to be problematic due to both lack of technology at the schools and lack of time to devote to additional activities.
Maine	The state cadre training was an excellent model. It motivated SDE staff members who do not often work together to meet regularly and discuss assessment and its effects on instruction. ETS training broadened the mind and skill sets of SDE staff members and the concepts of the DE EAG project served as a “unifier” of state assessment for all groups within the SDE. Staff frequently talked about best practices, e.g., by consistently asking whether a practice would “touch the instructional core” i.e., will it make a difference in teaching and learning. The on-line collaborative Communities Web site did not work well for Maine. It is a good device for storing and retrieving information but not for communicating and stimulating discussion.
Michigan	The ETS state cadre training model was terrific. The training provided access to the best people and materials for the success of this project. Also, because all project partner states participated in the trainings, participants heard what other states were doing and the challenges they were facing. This was invaluable. The on-line Communities web site was good for look up of reference materials and storage, but Michigan did not use it for communication of ideas or conversations.
North Carolina	The ETS training and the state cadre model were excellent. North Carolina had a good team to start but some members didn’t finish due to internal

	<p>SDE changes and priorities.</p> <p>The on-line Communities site was not used very effectively by North Carolina. It was a useful depository, but not particularly useful for communication and discussions of themes. North Carolina would like to try to use the collaborative Communities site to continue some of the activities. Because of tighter budgets it will be harder for the NC SDE staff to visit the volunteer schools in the next year so the Communities site could be a useful tool.</p>
Nebraska	<p>The ETS training and the opportunity for state and local teams to work through the materials together and hear what other states and local school districts were doing was invaluable. The DE EAG model helped to extend assessment literacy to school leaders.</p> <p>While the state team was well-selected and trained, there wasn't enough time and resources for it to work effectively with locals.</p>
Virginia	<p>State department staff worked to participate in the WebEx training sessions--one issue was internet connectivity early on and another issue was scheduling staff to participate together. WebEx sessions were more beneficial when there was more sharing with team members. Virginia appreciated the ETS training sessions and valued Rick Stiggins' efforts to share information and address concerns. The state team was energized by other state teams' enthusiasm and appreciated the planning time with its own team members to map out a plan of action.</p>

Goal 2 Lessons Learned

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffing for the activities of the DE EAG project at the SDE level was an issue in almost every state. The grant did not provide funding for staff which meant several staff members were extending themselves well beyond a full-time load and the burden became too heavy for most of the states to handle. • When attempting to build a professional development pyramid, it is essential for those involved to have professional development assigned as part of their on-going responsibilities. This is rarely the case for SDE staff. • Because of SDE budget constraints and shifts in assignments of personnel, the composition of many of the EAG teams changed, leading to a loss of continuity and collective learning. Ultimately this affected the quality of the roll out work with the high school learning teams. • Communication at all levels and between all parties can be facilitated by a common understanding of terms and a greater understanding of the parts everyone plays in achieving shared goals. • The on-line communities' site could have been more useful had it been implemented and promoted at the beginning of the project. Also, users agreed that if access to training materials such as the DVD presentations and documents been incorporated as part of the on-line resource, interest in using the site might have increased.

Goal 3

District/ high school teams begin to implement vision and assessment for learning in schools and classrooms, integrating with individual learning plans or personalized instruction.

The intent of this goal was for volunteer high school teachers to form learning communities and to use formative classroom assessment as part of a comprehensive assessment continuum. It was intended that teachers would regularly meet to examine student and teacher work and help each other with effective teaching strategies.

The major activities provided under this goal were:

1. On-site training in learning team development/facilitation and *assessment for learning*, for SDE and high school teams in St. Louis, MO and Portland, OR, provided by ETS.
2. On-line training in *assessment for learning* for SDE and high school teams provided by ETS.

Table 3. Summary of State progress relative to Goal 3

Arizona	The state worked with two high school learning teams, mostly through a paced WebEx training model using the ETS materials and led by a state person. Arizona’s state facilitator visited the sites and participated in cadre meetings on a bi-monthly basis. The State facilitator also directed the online course, provided descriptive feedback for all activities through the online environment, modeled formative assessment teaching strategies, participated in the blogs and discussion forums for all modules. Arizona addressed the issue of time for teacher collaboration by using the online environment to create an active online discussion board. Arizona created an asynchronous model which allows teachers to work and submit at their own pace within the confines of the modular timeframe. High school participation in the CCSSO sponsored ETS WebEx training was useful.
Connecticut	The state team worked with the high school learning teams mostly through 2-3 day summer institutes. During the school year the state team did only limited follow-up with high school teams. It was observed that in those schools where there was a strong commitment from the school leadership the learning teams were more successful than in schools without such commitment. High school participation in the ETS WebEx training was high but follow up activities were limited because of time constraints for the high school teachers.

Delaware	The main challenge was obtaining high school leadership commitment to the project. Either the SDE cadre had to facilitate the high school learning teams or the teams were left to operate on their own. This became a time and resource issue. High school participation in the CCSSO sponsored ETS WebEx training was low.
Iowa	Iowa found that those high schools that included SDE support/follow-up, as part of the training, were more successful and able to sustain the learning team model than high schools without SDE support/follow-up. Time and scheduling proved to be a major obstacle for teachers.
Louisiana	LDE assessment staff saw a distinct shift in attitudes regarding intentional instructional and assessment practices among the school learning team during the course of this project. They gradually became more reflective and confident when planning classroom instruction. Some members of the school learning teams became more open to involving students in their own learning (requiring the teachers to loosen the reins a little bit) and most were pleased with the results. One learning team experienced resistance from school administration regarding organizing team meetings and allowing time to meet as professionals to discuss/work on assignments.
Maine	The training provided by ETS was on target in terms of classroom assessment content. However, there needed to be a greater emphasis and training at the front end regarding the purpose of a learning team, how to form them, and how to make them work. The mindset of the high school learning team was never really developed at the volunteer sites. SDE cadre did not do enough with the high school teams, mainly due to small staff, resources, and other assignments.
Michigan	As a part of a state-wide high school initiative on balanced assessment systems, four high priority schools were identified and provided the additional professional development materials and support from the grant. A state team member was assigned to the high priority school as a resource. Of the 4 high priority schools in the study, 3 were not successful in implementation. These 3 schools had other competing school improvement activities in the building.
Nebraska	Time was a big factor in the state's ability to effectively implement the project. Nebraska learned that it wasn't enough to only go through the ETS training materials. School learning teams that gave time to examining student work and thinking about instructional practices saw positive changes. For example, students began asking questions, e.g., "Why aren't the learning targets posted?" "Where is the rubric for this assignment?" Also, teachers began to take more risks and try unique methods. The SDE cadre could not work one-on-one with the high school learning teams. There were too many other priorities and changes occurring at the state level.
North Carolina	North Carolina worked with three volunteer high schools. One of the three schools never "bought in" to the project, and a second of the high schools dropped out of the project early. The third high school did make some

	<p>small steps within one department, which may ultimately “take hold.” While the ETS training and materials were excellent, the learning teams were unable to go through the paced materials on their own.</p>
Virginia	<p>Virginia worked with two schools that had principals who took charge of establishing the learning communities and made some progress. The ETS training materials were appreciated by school staff.</p> <p>The CCSSO sponsored ETS WebEx training did not prove to be very effective. There did not seem to be enough creative thinking in the WebEx training process and it was logistically difficult to involve school staff due to their schedules.</p>

Goal 3 Lessons Learned

- Motivation was a big issue that plagued SDE staff as they tried to recruit and convince school learning teams to participate. A few states felt that incentives, perhaps a stipend, would have helped.
- To be successful, school learning teams need strong support and committed leadership from the school administrators. When this was lacking school learning teams for the most part floundered, due to other pressing priorities and a lack of motivation.
- Learning teams which were able to move through the material and work on some of the techniques began to see potential benefits.
- For a training program such as ETS’ Leading Professional Development to take hold, adequate time must be built in to a school learning team schedule.
- Simply working on formative classroom assessment techniques did not provide enough of a “catch” for most administrators or teachers. This type of work must be connected to other state-wide initiatives so that school staff can see how and why this is important and will work.
- Learning teams require a prerequisite bonding and a habit of mind to be self-directed with the paced learning materials. Much more time should have been spent on team building to create a focused, motivated and knowledgeable learning team, able to work in a self-directed way on the ETS materials.

Goal 4

Generate and disseminate tools, techniques, and new knowledge to support future approaches to teaching and learning, while strengthening the commitment to all students learning at higher levels.

This project has made it a priority to disseminate information about the DE EAG project, both within and beyond the project team. The major activities provided under this goal were:

1. Participating states periodically shared their lessons and experiences with each other at project meetings, i.e., St. Louis and Portland, and during the on-line training workshops.
2. Project leaders made nine presentations at national conferences such as the Large Scale Assessment Conference, the National Conference on Student Assessment, and the American Educational Research Association annual meetings.
3. Four states presented their formative assessment implementation designs and reported on outcomes from their first year of experience and lessons learned regarding organization, training, and technical assistance at the CCSSO Education Leader Conference on Using Data to Improve Instruction in September 2008.
4. Each participating state received additional support for training and technical assistance and materials to provide follow-up and implementation activities with participating schools.
5. A final evaluation report is being produced by CPRE, the project’s external evaluator, and will be freely available to the public in March 2009 on the CCSSO website. Information about this project was also made available in a feature article in the August 15, 2007 issue of Education Week. In that article entitled, “10-State Pilot Preparing Teachers to Develop Tests,” reporter Scott Cech featured the keys to quality classroom assessment that guide this project as well as information about the work of the project itself.

Table 4. Sustainability and capacity building and anticipated next steps for states

Arizona	Arizona will build on what has been started by assisting the districts with research-based best practices. Arizona is enhancing and redesigning its online instructional formative assessment course and is also revising the modular timeframes for a more successful course presentation.
Connecticut	Connecticut districts continue to seek information regarding formative assessment and the state cadre is well-situated to answer questions and is anticipating that it will build formative assessment into its curriculum development projects.
Delaware	Delaware has presented on classroom formative assessment to the State Board of Education and statewide educational organizations and will continue to do so. The challenges will be to make connections between this work and other initiatives and to find support within the budget.
Iowa	A statewide initiative to include formative assessment in school professional development is underway. Iowa is building a formative

	assessment knowledge base within the school districts and that districts have policies that support formative assessment.
Louisiana	The LDE, in collaboration with a professional development contractor, will launch a statewide two-year professional development program to assist educators in implementing formative assessment practices. Some members of the school learning teams initially seemed resistant to learning about yet another new learning tool or “educational trend” (and were somewhat reluctant to embrace the time commitment involved), but all expressed professional growth by the end of the year as a result of their participation in the DE EAG project.
Maine	The state department is moving forward with a change in statutes that will require comprehensive and balanced assessments. The DE EAG project helped to focus thinking around these issues.
Michigan	The project has affected the way Michigan will roll out future classroom formative assessment professional development. In particular, the focus of the training will be on building the assessment literacy/capacity of cadres of Michigan educators who will act as coaches for site-based learning teams. These coaches will provide continuous, job-embedded training and support for learning teams. This on-going support will include training related to facilitation skills, teacher observation and feedback, strategies for using data and evidence of student learning to improve and focus instruction, and effective school- and classroom-level assessment practices focused on improving student learning. Additionally, there are opportunities for instructional coaches that are being identified for Phase 1 and 2 high priority schools to also receive training on formative assessments.
North Carolina	NC is creating online professional development training modules that will focus on helping teachers and students implement effective formative assessment. The training modules will focus on the importance of learning teams and will provide instructions on how to incorporate the modules within a learning team environment.
Nebraska	Nebraska plans to disseminate the classroom formative assessment materials used in this project statewide. However, this may take some time as the SDE is currently building new state assessments based on new state mandates.
Virginia	The school divisions (districts) currently lack interest in pursuing formative assessment and therefore further work in this area is questionable.

Goal 4 Lessons Learned

<p>Effective dissemination of findings and lessons learned needs to take various forms, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sharing among project participants throughout program planning, development, and implementation. ▪ Press releases or similar lay/human interest level information that can be used by
--

- project partners to burnish their participation in the initiative.
- Attention needs to be given to the kinds of information provided to policymakers and key decision makers, such as user friendly information in a form easily accessed and useful to policymakers and key decision makers.
 - Preparing materials that can be used for training purposes by state education agencies

Summary

It was important for participating states to have funding and influential organizational partners during the start up phase of their planning for and trying out aspects of formative classroom assessment. It was also critical to have shared understandings about project goals and support from as many stake holder groups and levels of state and local governance as possible. These shared understandings can help ensure that formative classroom assessment efforts are not owned by just a few and that provisions for it will be made in budgets and action plans.

Keys to successful implementations of effective classroom formative assessment requires a shared understanding that responsible and effective assessment is broader than testing. Successful implementations also require collaboration among staff beyond those historically responsible for testing programs; success requires co-development, training, and ownership of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development/technical assistance staff. Training will need to be provided relative to assessment literacy at various levels, including state education agency staff, local leadership, teachers, students, and parents.

There also needs to be consistency of staff during the “roll out” phase of implementation. In most cases, that means dedicated staff beyond those currently assigned to assessment or professional development efforts. Attention also needs to be given to scheduling structures in place in schools so that teachers have dedicated time to work together. While communication at all levels and between all parties can be facilitated by on-line communities, such communities are insufficient by themselves.

The call for effective classroom formative assessment cannot be perceived as an “add on” to instruction. It must be planned and implemented as a critical aspect of the on-going instructional process. To be successful, school teams need strong support and committed leadership from school administrators. Finally, the formative classroom assessment work must be clearly linked to other state-wide initiatives so that the importance of the work becomes transparent.

Project Evaluation Report

[Learning about Assessment: Evaluation of a Ten-State Effort to Build Assessment Capacity in High Schools.](http://www.ccsso.org/projects/scass/projects/formative_assessment_for_students_and_teachers/1541.cfm) Elliot Weinbaum, Consortium for Policy Research in Education, for Delaware EAG Consortium project, 2006-2008. CPRE, 2009.
http://www.ccsso.org/projects/scass/projects/formative_assessment_for_students_and_teachers/1541.cfm

Presentations at National Conferences—2007, 2008:

“Balanced and Formative Assessment Systems”

Pat Roschewski, Nebraska Department of Education

“Balanced and Formative Assessment Systems: Scaling Up!”

Chris Paulino and LisaRose Blanchette, Arizona Department of Education

“Balanced and Formative Assessment Systems: Ten State Stories”

Elliot Weinbaum, CPRE

“CCSSO: Formative Assessment Time to reflect, refocus and recommit”

Maine Department of Education

“Council Communities: Facilitating Project Leadership”

Rhea Steele, CCSSO

“Delaware’s AFL Learning Teams: Successes, Challenges and Next Steps”

Delaware Department of Education

“Formative Assessment FOR Learning in Action”

Chris Paulino, Arizona Department of Education

“High School Initiative to Help Districts Build Comprehensive Assessment Systems”

Barbara Q. Beaudin, Connecticut Department of Education

“Implementing and Improving Balanced Assessment Systems for High School Success and Beyond”

Mary Anne Butler, Connecticut Department of Education

“Implementing and Improving Balanced Assessment Systems for High School Success and Beyond”

Wendy Roberts, Delaware Department of Education

“Implementing and Improving Comprehensive and Balanced Learning and Assessment Systems for Success in High School Success and *Beyond*”

Angela Faherty, Maine Department of Education

“Implementing a Formative Assessment Model with Districts and Schools: What North Carolina has learned”

Sarah McManus, North Carolina Department of Education

“Iowa Enhanced Assessment Grant”

Colleen Anderson, Iowa Department of Education

“Online Professional Development in Classroom Assessment Teachers”

Doris Redfield, Edvantia

“Redesigning Schools for the 21st Century”

Ray Pechone, Stanford University

“Teacher Learning Teams to Enhance Classroom Assessment”

Elliot Weinbaum, CPRE