



*Guidelines for*  
**Creating the Student Performance Data Document**



## Guidelines for Creating the Student Performance Data Document

The Student Performance Data Document is the first requirement in completing your Student Performance Diagnostic. After you attach and upload the document, you will respond to the Evaluative Criteria and Diagnostic Questions in ASSIST™. Remember that this document is intended to be a summary of your data. It should not be overwhelming in length or in the time you spend putting it together. Use documentation you already have whenever possible. You can always provide additional, in-depth information to the External Review Team members when they arrive on-site.

There are two purposes of the Student Performance Data Document. First, the Data Document serves as a “summary” of the data your institution uses for decision-making. This brief summary can also be used to provide your student performance data in a meaningful way to various stakeholder groups. The second purpose is to provide the External Review Team a summary of student performance at your institution before the on-site portion of the AdvancED External Review. This summary will also provide the team with a better understanding of your responses to the Student Performance Diagnostic.

Below are steps to create your data document. (This can be a Word document/PDF.)

### 1. Select data for your document

To create the Data Document, you should carefully select data that you already use in your decision-making processes. Use only data that supports your institutional improvement goals and provides evidence for your answers in the Student Performance Diagnostic. Combine all of your student performance data in to one document to upload in ASSIST®.

### 2. Review the Evaluative Criteria and Diagnostic Questions

Carefully review the Student Performance Evaluative Criteria and Diagnostic Questions included in Appendix A. (See below, pg.5) The External Review Team will evaluate your student performance against the Evaluative Criteria using the answers you provide to the Diagnostic Questions as well as the Data Document.

### 3. Create your document

- Provide documentation or a brief description about how results from your assessments prove that:
  - 1) The assessments you use are aligned to your curriculum
  - 2) All instruction is based on high priority curricular needs.
- Document or describe the degree to which all of your summative assessments are valid, reliable, and unbiased. This will help you address *Evaluative Criterion 1* in the Student Performance Diagnostic.

- Provide documentation or a brief description about how you ensure all assessments are administered with complete fidelity to administrative procedures. Describe how the students to whom these assessments were administered are accurately representative of the students served, and how accommodations are made so that good decisions can be made from the data. This will help you address *Evaluative Criterion 2* in the Student Performance Diagnostic.
- For *Evaluative Criteria 3* and *4*, provide assessment results in tables, graphs or other depictions that provide summative assessment data with longitudinal results that are disaggregated by appropriate subgroups for the institution. (In some cases, a “report card” provided by an outside agency such as a state department or ministry of education could address most or all of the following criteria.)

When selecting data to include in the summative assessment data, consider the following criteria:

1. Use summative assessment data, which can include both standardized assessments and locally developed assessments.
2. Include any assessments that the institution is required to administer.
3. Include data from summative assessments that support the mission of the institution (such as core academics or performance assessments specific to the purpose of the institution).
4. Provide longitudinal results of the same assessment from multiple administrations, if available, to allow for analysis of trends.
5. Incorporate comparison data to like institutions that have similar student populations.
6. Disaggregate data by appropriate subgroups for the institution (i.e. SES, ethnicity, gender, grade level, ELL).
7. Demonstrate positive student performance results by presenting data using status, improvement and/or growth.
  - Status: the level of performance on an assessment or group of assessments against a set of criteria.
  - Improvement: trend data of the same grade level and/or course over several years.
  - Growth: student cohort data regarding the performance of a group of students over time.

A combination of documents could provide additional helpful information.

Remember to keep the document brief: it is intended to be a summary of student performance, not an in-depth presentation.

#### **4. Upload your document into ASSIST™**

Review your document to ensure that it contains your institutional improvement goals, evidence that addresses the Evaluative Criteria and data that supports the answers you have provided in the Student Performance Diagnostic. When the document is complete, attach the document in response to the first question in the Student Performance Diagnostic in ASSIST™.

## **Appendix A: Student Performance Evaluative Criteria and Diagnostic Questions**

The Evaluative Criteria from the Student Performance Diagnostic are listed below as a reference for you. These are the criteria you must respond to when you are completing the Student Performance Diagnostic in ASSIST<sup>®</sup>.

### **1. Assessment Quality**

*Level 4:* The array of assessment devices used by the institution to determine students' performances is sufficiently aligned so that valid inferences can be reached regarding students' status with respect to the entire set of curricular aims regarded as high-priority, "must accomplish," instructional targets. The documentation provided in support of this alignment is persuasive. All of the assessments used are accompanied by evidence demonstrating that they satisfy accepted technical requirements such as validity, reliability, absence of bias and instructional sensitivity.

*Level 3:* The array of assessment devices used by the institution to determine students' performances is sufficiently aligned so that valid inferences can be reached regarding students' status with respect to the majority of those curricular aims regarded as high-priority instructional targets. The documentation provided in support of this alignment is relatively persuasive. Most of the assessments used are accompanied by evidence demonstrating that they satisfy accepted technical requirements.

*Level 2:* The array of assessment devices used by the institution to determine students' performances is sufficiently aligned so that valid inferences can be reached regarding students' status with respect to some of those curricular aims regarded as high-priority instructional targets. The documentation provided in support of this alignment is less than persuasive. Some of the assessments used are accompanied by evidence demonstrating that they satisfy accepted technical requirements.

*Level 1:* The array of assessment devices used by the institution to determine students' performances is not aligned and thus valid inferences are unlikely to be reached regarding students' status with respect to those curricular aims regarded as high-priority instructional targets. No documentation in support of alignment has been provided or, if provided, it is not persuasive. Few of the assessments used are accompanied by evidence demonstrating that they satisfy technical requirements.

### **2. Test Administration**

*Level 4:* All the assessments used by the institution to determine students' performances, whether externally acquired or internally developed, have been administered with complete fidelity to the administrative procedures appropriate for each assessment. In every instance, the students to whom these assessments were administered are accurately representative of

the students served by the institution. Appropriate accommodations have been provided for all assessments so that valid inferences can be made about all students' statuses with respect to all of the institution's targeted curricular outcomes.

*Level 3:* Most of the assessments used by the institution to determine students' performances have been administered with reasonable fidelity to the administrative procedures appropriate for each assessment. In most instances, the students to whom these assessments were administered are essentially representative of the students served by the institution. Appropriate accommodations have been provided for most assessments so that valid inferences can be made about most students' statuses with respect to most of the institution's targeted curricular outcomes.

*Level 2:* Some of the assessments used by the institution to determine students' performances have been administered with modest fidelity to the administrative procedures appropriate for each assessment. In some instances, the students to whom these assessments were administered are fairly representative of the students served by the institution. Appropriate accommodations have been provided for some assessments so that valid inferences can be made about some students' statuses with respect to some of the institution's targeted curricular outcomes.

*Level 1:* Few, if any, assessments used by the institution to determine students' performances have been administered with fidelity to the administrative procedures appropriate for each assessment. The students to whom these assessments were administered are not representative of the students served by the institution. Appropriate accommodations were not provided for assessments so that valid inferences cannot be made about students' statuses with respect to any of the institution's targeted curricular outcomes.

### **3. Quality of Learning**

*Level 4:* Evidence of student learning promoted by the institution is well analyzed and clearly presented. In comparison to institutions functioning in a similar educational context, students' statuses, improvement and/or growth evidence indicates that the level of student learning is substantially greater than what would otherwise be expected.

*Level 3:* Evidence of student learning promoted by the institution is acceptably analyzed and presented with reasonable clarity. In comparison to institutions functioning in a similar educational context, students' statuses, improvement and/or growth evidence indicates that the level of student learning is at or above what would otherwise be expected.

*Level 2:* Evidence of student learning promoted by the institution is indifferently analyzed and presented with little clarity. In comparison to institutions functioning in a similar educational context, students' statuses, improvement and/or growth evidence indicates that the level of student learning is below what would otherwise be expected.

*Level 1:* Evidence of student learning promoted by the institution is poorly analyzed and is presented unclearly. In comparison to institutions functioning in a similar educational context, students' statuses, improvement and/or growth evidence indicates that the level of student learning is substantially below what would otherwise be expected.

#### **4. Equity of Learning**

*Level 4:* Evidence of student learning indicates no significant achievement gaps among subpopulations of students, or the achievement gaps have substantially declined.

*Level 3:* Evidence of student learning indicates achievement gaps exist among subpopulations of students, and these achievement gaps have noticeably declined.

*Level 2:* Evidence of student learning indicates achievement gaps exist among subpopulations of students, and these achievement gaps demonstrate a modest decline.

*Level 1:* Evidence of student learning indicates achievement gaps exist among subpopulations of students and that minimal or no change has occurred in these achievement gaps.

### **Student Performance Diagnostic Questions**

The questions from the analysis portion of the Student Performance Diagnostic are listed below as a reference for you. These are the questions you must respond to when you are completing the Student Performance Diagnostic in ASSIST™.

#### Areas of Notable Achievement

1. Which area(s) are above the expected levels of performance?
2. Describe the area(s) that show a positive trend in performance.
3. Which area(s) indicate the overall highest performance?
4. Which subgroup(s) show a trend toward increasing performance?
5. Between which subgroup is the achievement gap closing?
6. Which of the above reported findings are consistent with findings from other data sources?

#### Areas in Need of Improvement

1. Which area(s) are below the expected levels of performance?
2. Describe the area(s) that show a negative trend in performance.
3. Which area(s) indicate the overall lowest performance?
4. Which subgroup(s) show a trend toward decreasing performance?
5. Between which subgroup is the achievement gap becoming greater?
6. Which of the above reported findings are consistent with findings from other data sources?