Figure 5.3: Chart for Assessing Progress on Constantly Rating Effectiveness— Flirting, Dating, or Being Engaged?

Actions for Flirting With a PLC	Yes	No	As Evidenced By . . .
1. We use the assessments that come with the textbook series as our common formative assessments.			
2. Our principal requires us to do a common assessment every week. Before we can get the first assessment scored, the next one is due to be administered.			
3. Our team feels like we are "pushing paper" when doing common assessments.			
4. On our team, we ask our strongest teachers to create the assessment, and the rest of us just go along with it.		.	
5. We create common formative assessments during the summer, and they're still on our shelf.			
6. We don't see the point in comparing assessment data for instructional effectiveness. We are all professionals, and the students we serve are different.			
7. Our students are grouped by ability. Comparing instructional effectiveness on these common formative assessments is demoralizing.			
8. We're doing common formative assessments, though there wasn't a lot of explanation or guidance given.			
9. My team gives common formative assessments because my principal requires us to.			

Actions for Flirting With a PLC	Yes	No	As Evidenced By . . .
10. I don't get what makes a common formative assessment different from any other assessment. It's a new buzzword.			

Actions for Dating a PLC	Yes	No	As Evidenced By . . .
1. We do common assessments on our team. Someone else should score them.			
2. We do common assessments on our team. Someone else does score them.			
3. We never seem to get any further than examining the data to see how students performed.			
4. Our team isn't ready to talk about teacher effectiveness using common formative assessment data.			
5. We definitely use common formative assessment data as a grade. If we don't grade these assessments, our students will not take them seriously.			
6. Some teams opt to use common formative assessments, while other teams don't have to give them.			
7. Our principal has not communicated expectations regarding common formative assessments.			
8. We wish we did more with the data gathered from common formative assessments.			
9. We don't compare data with each other for fear that it will reflect negatively on our evaluations.			

Actions for Being Engaged to a PLC*	Yes	No	As Evidenced By . . .
1. We know that it's what teams do with data that matters. We translate data into information because "data alone will not help individuals or teams improve. They need the context of valid comparison to satisfy strengths and weaknesses." (DuFour et al., 2010, p. 200)			
2. We make sure that every teacher receives frequent and timely information regarding his or her students' success in learning the essential curriculum. We then use that information to identify strengths and weaknesses as part of a process of continuous improvement.			
3. We use apples-to-apples comparisons. "Comparisons are most informative when conditions are similar. . . Equivalent situations yield the most meaningful comparisons" (DuFour et al., 2010, p. 200).			
4. We calibrate scoring of student work. "Every team is engaged in a process to clarify consistent criteria by which to assess the quality of student work" (DuFour et al., 2008, pp. 116–117).			
5. We use balanced assessments. "No one source yields the comprehensive results necessary to inform and improve practice." We use "different types of formative assessments based on the knowledge or skills students are called upon to demonstrate rather than relying exclusively on one type of assessment—multiple-choice tests, performance-based assessments, constructed-response tests, and so on." We attempt to determine the best evidence of student learning and the most effective ways to gather that evidence. We develop multiple ways for students to demonstrate proficiency. (DuFour et al. 2010, pp. 200–201)			

6. We use a protocol for analyzing assessment data. A protocol specifically designed for common formative assessment analysis ensures that we honor every stage of the process. It structures the conversation around student work so that each team member has time to speak and everyone else has time to listen. We keep presenting, examining, questioning, and responding in balance so that the meeting moves optimally and is honest and respectful (McDonald, Mohr, Dichter, & McDonald, 2007, as cited in DuFour et al., 2010).		
7. We have a fixation with results that does not mean inattention to people. PLCs are committed to both results and relationships as they recognize that the best way to achieve a culture of collective responsibility is through collaborative relationships that foster ongoing growth and development (DuFour et al., 2010).		
8. We collect instructionally actionable common assessment data so we can be ready to act on them.		

Sources: DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). Revisiting Professional Learning Communities at Work: New insights for improving schools. *Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press, pp. 116–117.*

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2010). Learning by doing: A handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work *(2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press, pp. 86, 200–201.*

McDonald, J. P., Mohr, N., Dichter, A., & McDonald, E. C. (2007). The power of protocols: An educator's guide to better practice *(2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.*

Reeves, D. B. (2002). The leader's guide to standards: A blueprint for educational equity and excellence. *San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.*