Artifact Guidance for Demonstrating Instructional Outcomes:

Embedded Practice & Student Learning Goals

RIDE Rhode Island Department of Education

Context

The selection, use, and submission of quality artifacts is an integral component of demonstrating instructional outcomes for the *Embedded Practice* or *Student Learning Goals* models. We hope that educators will find it useful to learn how to *better select* and *use* artifacts as evidence of their impact on student learning.

This guidance document was informed by studying artifacts submitted to RIDE by piloting educators as part of their participation in the Student Learning Pilot, a two-year initiative from which both Embedded Practice and Student Learning Goals were confirmed as formal student learning models starting in the 2019-20 school year. The goal of the artifact review was to be able to offer *specific guidance* to educators on how to select quality artifacts as evidence of student learning.

To support this study, RIDE contracted with the Center for Assessment, a non-profit educational corporation, who specializes in this type of analysis. To determine "quality," it reviewed and assessed a total of 125 artifacts using these three questions:

> 1. *What is being measured in the artifact (which content and which standards) and do they represent meaningful content?*
> 2. *Do the artifacts represent deep understanding of the content knowledge and skills?*
> 3. *Can the artifacts lead to instructional decision-making strategies and plans that will meet the needs of the students?*

These three questions provide a common lens for teachers *and* evaluators regarding the selection, use, and submission of artifacts. They also guide conversations throughout the cycle(s) of instruction.

Considerations for Evidence Selection

The key criterion for selecting artifacts is to provide evidence of student learning in order to show *instructional effectiveness*. This means teachers should gather evidence about student understanding of grade-level appropriate learning targets/standards prior to instruction, during instruction, and after instruction. The assumption is that significant measurable progress (i.e., growth or mastery), from the included group of students on these assessments will demonstrate both student learning and instructional effectiveness. It is important to note that it is up to each LEA, with the support of the District Evaluation Committee (DEC), to more specifically define the qualifying measures of progress (i.e., *significant, sufficient, moderate, or minimal)* for the purposes of understanding instructional effectiveness.

The artifacts to be used as evidence could include pre-assessments (formal/informal), reflections on how the teacher modified or adapted instruction based upon formative assessments throughout the cycle of instruction, and evidence of student growth at the end of the cycle of instruction. In general, the

emphasis should be on the *quality* of the representative evidence rather than *quantity,* based upon how it supports the claim about the teacher's overall instructional effectiveness.

From the artifact review, RIDE learned that these five prompts below will help an educator select quality artifacts to discuss with their evaluator throughout the cycle(s) of instruction in order to show evidence of their instruction.

> ✓ *Describe the problem or area targeted, including grade level and subject area.*
> ✓ *Explain the content standards(s) addressed and justify why this is meaningful content for the designated grade level and subject area.*
> ✓ *Explain which students will be targeted (all, subset) and on what basis was that decision made.*
> ✓ *Explain what evidence will be collected over the cycle of instruction to demonstrate instructional effectiveness and on what basis these decisions were made. Be sure to address how the evidence collected will provide evidence prior to, during, and after instruction in order to modify instruction and track student progress over time.*
> ✓ *Explain how the evidence elicits students' deeper understanding of the content standards.*

Criteria for Quality of Evidence Artifact Submission Process

While it is up to districts to determine which evidence best represents student learning, educators are encouraged to make thoughtful decisions about which artifacts make it possible to evaluate the quality, purpose, and impact of said artifacts.

Therefore, RIDE's guidance for gathering artifacts is for teachers to present an <u>evidence set</u> that shows *how students demonstrated progress as a direct result of instruction*. Likely, this will include multiple documents that show *how the teacher's instructional decisions impacted student learning*.

An artifact set, comprised of various documents, will ideally contain the following:

> ✓ **Task, assessment data, rubric, and/or student samples**
> > o *It is clear from these documents that the content being assessed is standards-aligned, meaningful, and deep*
> ✓ **Teacher reflection**
> > o *Shows insight into the teachers' thought processes and how they used information about student learning to inform their future instructional plans for individuals or groups of students*
> > o *It is clear from this reflection that teachers' instructional intent and how student data allows them to engage in improving their practice will ultimately affect student outcomes*

Results from Processing Artifacts

An artifact set must be thoughtfully considered for a teacher's impact on student outcomes to be fully understood. The following criteria offers a structure and a process for a teacher to organize, and ultimately, reflect upon their impact on student outcomes. Though the example below is focused on science content, the same approach can be used across all content areas and grade spans:

Artifact Set to be Uploaded	Content Assessed	Meaningful Content	Deep Understanding	Planning Purposes	Clarity of Information
Literacy in Science: ▪ Several tasks related to explaining and evaluating scientific concepts ▪ Performance rubric ▪ 3 student samples ▪ Teacher Reflection	Middle school science literacy	Grade appropriate NGSS expectations in Middle School Science: in addition to knowing and understanding science content, students need to be able to evaluate claims and communicate scientific ideas and principles.	Multiple assessment opportunities probed deeper understanding and explanation of scientific phenomena through writing; rubric used included dimensions related to the science concepts as well as literacy concepts	The teacher could use the information to flexibly group students and also plan whole-group instruction.	All information was clear.

An artifact set which identifies the content, how the artifacts are related, and their purpose would allow a reviewer, and ultimately an evaluator, to make sense of them and how they relate to the expected instructional outcomes, and consequently, as a means for demonstrating teacher effectiveness.

Questions?

We encourage you to email edeval@ride.ri.gov with any questions related to the content of this guidance document.