

Table 4.3 Comparison of Low- and High-Capacity Data Use

<i>Low-capacity data use</i>	<i>High-capacity data use</i>
Misinterprets and misunderstands data	Accurately interprets data and discerns what they mean
Uses aggregated and disaggregated data only	Regularly uses item-level data and student work
Accepts achievement gaps as inevitable	Responds to achievement gaps with immediate concern and corrective action
Uses single measures to draw conclusions	Uses multiple sources of data before drawing conclusions
Uses only summative measures	Uses formative and summative measures
Blames students and external causes for failure	Looks for causes for failure that are within educators' control
Draws conclusions without verifying hypotheses with data	Uses student work and data about practice and research to verify hypotheses
Fails to monitor implementation and results; big surprises at the end	Regularly monitors implementation and student learning; no surprises
Responds as individual administrators and teachers	Responds in teams and as a system
Prepares for tests by drilling students on test items	Aligns curriculum with standards and assessments; implements research-based improvements in curriculum, instruction, and assessment
Tutors only those students just missing the cutoff for proficiency—"bubble kids"	Differentiates instruction; provides extra help and enrichment for all who need it
Tracks students into classes by perceived ability	Increases the rigor of the curriculum for all students; assigns the best teachers to those who need them most
Chooses strategies based on instinct or the latest educational fad	Chooses strategies that are culturally proficient and research-based and have a logical link to the intended outcome