At the beginning of the school year, an elementary teacher reviews her students' previous year's data records in addition to the common beginning-of-year assessments and other observations. After an individual review of her students' data, she determines that writing represents a wide number of ability levels, as expected. Before determining how she will support her students in her class through the planned curriculum, she decides to have a conversation with her teaching team (or coach, colleague, administrator, etc.) about common findings from students' BOY data at that grade level. This conversation supports some of her initial conclusions. She will be evaluated through the portfolio model as an alternative to the original SLO process. The teacher will collect work samples from three representative students to track growth and progress. She chooses to use writing as a prioritized content area for the year.

The teacher identifies the content standards that all students would benefit from, which includes support with overall organization and development across the types of writing (CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.3.4), as well as a focus on conventions (CCSS.ELA-Literacy.L.3.2). Using her available data, she selects three students to represent general ability levels in her class: high performing, typically performing, and low performing. Early in the year, the teacher meets with her evaluator as part of the regular evaluation cycle to discuss professional practice, professional responsibilities, and student learning. This discussion will include learning expectations for her students to meet the individual needs of each student over the course of the cycle of instruction. Together, they determine how to maintain the portfolio. In this case, she has chosen to collect 3-5 work samples that represent her students' growth at three times throughout the year, as well as the overall class-wide writing data. This will corroborate evidence of student learning with the three representative student samples within the portfolio. Based on this data discussion, the evaluator and teacher agree this is an appropriate plan of action.

Throughout her first narrative writing unit as planned within the curriculum, she collects and reflects upon her students' work and adjusts her instructional practice to meet her students' various needs in writing. She provides ongoing feedback, both written and verbal, to her students so that they have an opportunity to reflect on and improve their writing. After reviewing the new 3E/3.5 rubric, she can strive to earn a 3 or a 4 by including students' reflections within the portfolio artifacts. While planning and implementing her second informational writing unit, she reflects on the end-of-unit data and her pre-assessment data to inform what her students need as well as her instructional methods to best meet students' needs. This includes focusing on organization and development (CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.3.4), as well as conventions (CCSS.ELA-Litearcy.L.3.2) with all ability levels within another genre of writing. Later, at her next check-in with her evaluator, she highlights the progress that her three representative students made through the first unit of study. The data include student work samples that are scored with feedback, in addition to students' reflections on their own writing. The evaluator and the teacher reflected on the whole-class data sheets to identify trends and reflect on instructional methods that should be sustained, eliminated, and improved upon.

As part of her preparation for her end-of-year conference, the teacher collects the remaining evidence for the three representative students as well as the overall data for her students' writing. Her final portfolio includes three end-of-unit writing assessments for each of the three students. Each of those end-of-unit assessments includes the actual student writing, scored rubric with feedback, and a student reflection. Recognizing that the final rating is made by the evaluator, the teacher and evaluator reflect on professional practice and responsibilities, as well as student learning using the approved evaluation system rubric(s). They also discuss how the data align with evidence of instructional practices in order to determine how she will approach writing instruction in the coming year, as well as opportunities for professional learning.