## FALA FRAMEWORK: A LEARNING PROGRESSION FOR NOVICE TEACHERS' USE OF FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Carolyn Mitten Westmont College cmitten@westmont.edu

Keywords: Learning Trajectories, Assessment and Evaluation, Teacher Knowledge

Formative assessment has been identified as one way that teachers can gather critical information about a student's level of understanding in order to make informed instructional adaptations that meet the needs of all students (NCTM, 2000; Shepard et al., 2005). Over several decades, research has shown the potential of formative assessment to effectively improve student achievement (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Kingston & Nash, 2011). Despite its potential, issues in preparing teachers to implement formative assessment practices has kept its potential from being realized (Schoenfeld, 2015) and many teachers have limited understanding of its use (Shepard et al., 2005).

In order to better understand how to prepare teachers to use formative assessment, a trajectory describing how teachers develop formative assessment knowledge and practice is needed. The Formative Assessment Levels of Appropriation (FALA) framework evolved from a larger qualitative research study on the evolution of formative assessment knowledge and practice of novice teachers from teacher preparation through their third year of teaching. Grounded in activity theory, the FALA framework describes the levels of appropriation (Grossman et al., 1998) for the five aspects of formative assessment defined by Black & Wiliam (2009). Table 1 provides an example of the framework for one aspect of formative assessment—clarifying intentions and criteria for success.

Table 1: Levels of Appropriation for Clarifying Intentions and Criteria for Success

| Tuble 1. Levels of appropriation for charifying intentions and criteria for Success |                       |                     |                       |                            |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Level 1   | Level 2               | Level 3             | Level 4               | Level 5                    |
| No conceptual   | Identifies learning   | Understands that    | Understands learning  | Understands the purpose    |
| understanding   | goals/criteria by     | learning            | goals/criteria and    | of learning goals/criteria |
| and/or not used   | name, but does not    | goals/criteria as   | their relationship to | in shaping student         |
| in the classroom  | understand purpose    | targets for         | student learning      | learning and frequently    |
|   | of learning           | performance and     | progressions. Makes   | makes instructional        |
|   | goals/criteria (e.g., | may share them with | connections to        | adaptations based on       |
|   | equates with          | students, but does  | instructional         | student progression        |
|   | standards) and does   | not impact student  | decisions but may     | towards learning goals.    |
|   | not engage students   | learning and        | have limited          | Evidence of student        |
|   | with them.            | instructional       | experience applying   | engagement with            |
|   |                       | decisions.          | to practice.          | goals/criteria.            |
|   |                       |                     |                       |                            |

To create each level of appropriation, a typological analysis approach (Hatch, 2002) was used to code course data over three semesters of a course on the use of formative assessment for teaching mathematics. The data was first chunked by individual assignment posts and coded by its reference to one of the five aspects. Next, data for each aspect was read through and examples of the five levels were coded based on Grossman & Smagorinsky's (1998) general definitions of each level of appropriation. All levels were re-read and summarized as one to two sentence generalizations. A secondary coder worked with the primary researcher on coding a sample of the data until an interrater reliability level of 81% as met (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

## References

- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education, 5(1), 7-74.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5-31.
- Grossman, P. L., Smagorinsky, P., & Valencia, S. (1999). Appropriating tools for teaching English: A theoretical framework for research on learning to teach. *American Journal of Education*, *108*(1), 1-29.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kingston, N., & Nash, B. (2011). Formative assessment: A meta-analysis and a call for research. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 30(4), 28-37.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Toward a shared craft. *Educational researcher*, *13*(5), 20-30.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2000). *Principles and standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (2015). Summative and formative assessments in mathematics supporting the goals of the Common Core Standards. *Theory Into Practice*, *54*(3), 183-194.
- Shepard, L., Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., Rust, F., Snowden, J. B., Gordon, E., Gutierrez, C., & Pacheco, A. (2005). Assessment. *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*, 2005, 275-326.