

*S²TEM SC Innovation Configuration Maps
Total Instructional Focus – Assessment*

Standard: Assessment is an important tool that guides and informs STEM instruction. An effective design will mirror the STEM curriculum and instruction methods, employing a range of assessment strategies. Both formative and summative assessments are incorporated so the resulting data can guide instruction and learning.

Total Instructional Focus – Assessment				
Sustaining	Fully Implementing	Refining and Expanding	Progressing	Getting Started
Desired Outcome 9.1: Teachers plan and implement a collaboratively developed formative and summative assessment design plan which mirrors the rigorous and engaging STEM curriculum.				
The Teacher:				
Utilizes the collaboratively developed formative and summative assessment plan which mirrors the rigorous and engaging STEM curriculum	Collaborates in a team to develop an assessment plan which mirrors the rigorous and engaging STEM curriculum	Collaborates in a team to develop an assessment plan	Recognizes the need for collaboratively developed assessment plan	Designs assessments independently
Desired Outcome 9.2: A range of assessment strategies is used to collect data to guide and inform instruction at all levels.				
The Administrator:				
Ensures congruence between what is taught and what is assessed	Identifies trends and patterns from classroom observation data of instruction and assessment	Monitors what is taught and what is assessed	Follows classroom observations with dialogue about student progress	Collects classroom observation data
Embeds time in the school day for teachers to collaborate on the acquisition of assessment strategies to guide and inform instruction	Ensures common planning time is in place and utilized for looking at student work and selecting appropriate assessment strategies	Ensures master schedule allows for common planning time for all grade levels/departments	Develops master schedule that is conducive to common planning time for some grade levels/departments	Develops master schedule that is not conducive to common planning time
The Teacher:				
Assesses student learning through observations, dialogue and analysis of formal and informal student responses and uses data from formative and summative assessments to address individual student misunderstandings and identify trends in student fallacies Uses collected information to make adjustments in instructional plans and learning strategies	Utilizes various assessment strategies, both traditional and nontraditional, to guide and inform instruction	Explores various assessment strategies to guide and inform instruction	Gains an initial understanding of the value of assessment for learning	Uses traditional assessments (i.e., pen and paper, quizzes, tests, benchmark tests)

Total Instructional Focus – Assessment				
Sustaining	Fully Implementing	Refining and Expanding	Progressing	Getting Started
Desired Outcome 9.3: Formative assessments are used daily before, during, and after instruction to assess student learning and guide and inform instruction.				
The Teacher:				
Design tasks, purposefully, to reveal students' progress towards defined learning targets	Utilizes strategies to enable the teacher, students and peers to access ideas for refinement of ongoing learning	Uses formative assessment strategies daily before and during instruction	Uses formative assessment strategies during instruction	Uses no formative assessment strategies to guide or inform instruction
Desired Outcome 9.4: Summative assessments offer students multiple opportunities to hone and build on knowledge, 21 st Century skills and assignments.				
The teacher implements summative assessments that:				
Integrates content standard(s) including technology standards with engineering processes and makes learning relevant	Employs purposeful integration of technology and content standard(s)	Includes a technology component without consideration as to the purpose or effectiveness of its inclusion	Engages students in a unit project assessing a single content area	Focuses on single content area with paper and pencil
Fosters communication and collaboration	Fosters interdependence among team members in order to be successful with each team member having an assigned role and responsibility	Allows students to complete end of unit assessment in pairs or teams	Requires students to present their end of unit project	Requires students to work independently on the end of unit test
Expects multiple solutions in which students must think analytically and try alternative strategies	Promote multiple solutions	Allows for multiple solutions	Offers open-ended tasks	Seeks single solution
Requires thinking and design processes that require iterative used by professionals (i.e., engineering design process/cycle, mathematical modeling, scientific practices)	Employs thinking at the create level of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy and a design process	Requires a design process	Requires thinking at the application level	Requires thinking at the lowest cognitive level

Bibliography

1. STEM for All

<http://www9.georgetown.edu/grad/gppi/hpi/cew/pdfs/stem-execsum.pdf>

National Research Council of the National Academies. *Successful K-12 STEM Education: Identifying Effective Approaches in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics*. 2011. National Academies Press Washington DC. www.nap.edu Accessed August, 2012

2. Innovation

Boss, Suzie. *Bringing Innovation to School: Empowering Students to Thrive in a Changing World*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree, 2012. Print.

Wagner, Tony. "Educating the Next Steve Jobs." *Wall Street Journal* (April 13, 2012): <<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304444604577337790086673050.html> >.

3. Data

Bernhardt, Victoria. *Data Analysis for Continuous School Improvement*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education, 2004. Print.

Institute of Education Sciences

http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/dddm_pg_092909.pdf

4. Collaboration

Bryk, Anthony and Schneider, Barbara. "Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for School Reform." <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/mar03/vol60/num06/Trust-in-Schools@-A-Core-Resource-for-School-Reform.aspx>

Covey, Stephen.. *The Speed of Trust*. New York: Free Press, 2006. Print.

Garmston, Robert and Wellman, Bruce. *Adaptive Schools: A Sourcebook for Developing Collaborative Groups*. Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon Publishers, 2009. Print

5. Continuous Learning

Talbert, Robert, mathematics professor
<http://chronicle.com/blognetwork/castingoutnines/2012/06/13/continuous-learning-instead-of-lifelong-learning/>

Costa, Arthur and Garmston, Robert. *Cognitive Coaching: A Foundation for Renaissance Schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, 2002. Print.

Costa, Arthur. *School as a Home for the Mind: Creating Mindful Curriculum, Instruction, and Dialogue*. Thousand Oaks, CA:Corwin Press,2008. Print

6. Engaged Community

Dufour, Rick. "Developing a Shared Vision. ASCD Express.2007. Accessed at <http://www.ascd.org/ascd-express/vol5/510-video.aspx>

National Standards for Family School Partnerships: An Implementation Guide. PTA.org. Accessed at <http://www.pta.org/2757.asp>

8. Curriculum

Burns, Rebecca, and Drake, Susan. *Meeting Standards through Integrated Curriculum*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. 2004. Print.

Common Core State Standards. <http://www.corestandards.org/>

Figliano, F. (2007, November). Strategies for Integrating STEM Content, A Pilot Case Study. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Harden, R.M.(2000). The integration ladder: a tool for curriculum planning and evaluation. Blackwell Science Ltd, MEDICAL EDUCATION

Lantz, H. B. (2009). Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education: What Form? What Function? www.currtechintegrations.com

Learn NC – Interdisciplinary Teaching. UNC School of Education - <http://www.learnnc.org/lp/pages/5196>

Moore, T. J., Wang, H., Roehrig, G. H., Park, N. S. (2011). STEM Integration: Teacher Perceptions and Practice. University of Minnesota, Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research

Morrison, J. (2006). Attributes of STEM Education. Teaching Institute for Excellence in STEM

National Science Board. A National Action Plan for Addressing the Critical Needs of the U.S. Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Education System. 2007. National Science Foundation. http://www.nsf.gov/nsb/documents/2007/stem_action.pdf. Accessed October, 2012.

Success at the Core. Four Questions About Curriculum Alignment. Vulcan Productions. 2010. <http://successatthecore.com/handouts/pdf/module7handout2.pdf>. Accessed September 2012.

9. Professional Learning

National Research Council of the National Academies. *Successful K-12 STEM Education: Identifying Effective Approaches in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics*. 2011. National Academies Press Washington DC. www.nap.edu Accessed August, 2012

Shulman, Lee. Pedagogical Content Knowledge. <http://www.leeshulman.net/domains-pedagogical-content-knowledge.html> Accessed September, 2012.

WestEd and National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. *STEM Teachers in Professional Learning Communities: From Good Teachers to Great Teaching*. 2010. http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/resource1097.pdf Accessed June 2012.

10. Assessment

Jacobs, Heidi H., et al. *Curriculum 21: Essential Education for a Changing World*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2010. Print

Lantz, Hayes B. Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education What Form? What Function? 2009. <http://www.currtechintegrations.com/pdf/STEMEducationArticle.pdf>. Accessed June, 2012.

Stiggins, Rick, et al. *Classroom Assessment for Student Learning: Doing it Right – Using it Well*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc., 2007. Print.

11. Instructional Support

National Research Council of the National Academies. *Successful K-12 STEM Education: Identifying Effective Approaches in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics*. 2011. National Academies Press Washington DC. www.nap.edu Accessed August, 2012

National Center on Time and Learning. *Why Time Matters*. <http://www.timeandlearning.org/why-time-matters> . Accessed October, 2012.

Also Consulted:

Arizona Dept of Ed – STEM Immersion Matrix – assessment tool
http://s3.amazonaws.com/hoth.bizango/assets/10649/SFAz-MCESA_STEM_Immersion_Matrix.pdf

Colorado Department of Education's Race to the TOP – STEM Integration -
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/RTTT/STEM.asp>

Fogerty's 10 levels of integration - <http://oregonstate.edu/instruction/ed555/zone3/tenways.htm>

Integrating Technology and the national S.T.E.M. standards - <http://www.tsaweb.org/stem-integration>

Loepp, Franzie L. Models of Curriculum Integration - <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JOTS/Summer-Fall-1999/PDF/Loepp.pdf>

Math and Science Connections - <http://www.nativeaccess.com/teachers/teaching-links/science-and-math-connections>

Models of Integration - <http://www.schoolandbeyond.org/sblstrategy3.html>

North Carolina STEM Rubrics - <https://www.ncstem.org/stem-strategy/attributes-rubric.html>

Teaching Today (McGraw Hill) – The basics – How to and Why Integrate -
<http://teachingtoday.glencoe.com/howtoarticles/curriculum-integration>

Texas High School Project T-STEM Initiative (2010). Texas Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics Academies Design Blueprint, Rubric, and Glossary. Available from:
<http://ntstem.tamu.edu/Academies/blueprint.pdf>