

Common Assignment Study

Student Work Analysis Protocol For Unit and Assignment Revision

(Approximately 2 hours and 35 minutes)

Homework

In advance of the session, teachers will fill in the **Evidence Alignment Tool** (see page 3) with standards/learning outcomes for the unit.

Introduction to the protocol and goals—content lead and/or teacher facilitator (5 minutes)

Form small groups of about four to five members each. There should be at least one group per common assignment within the unit. Facilitators will determine composition of each group.

Part 1. Student work analysis (65 minutes)

A. Pair work (45 minutes)

Teachers review student work samples 1–6 (in order or in reverse order) and fill in Evidence Alignment Tool together in pairs.

Directions: Review each piece of student work, and decide whether the sample provides evidence of “minimal understanding,” “acceptable understanding,” or “strong understanding” for any of the standards or learning outcomes. Then, identify evidence from the student work that illustrates that level of understanding by quoting, citing examples, or describing what you observed. Indicate the sample number and the general location of the evidence within the sample (page/paragraph). Repeat for each student work sample.

B. Small group discussion (20 minutes)

Directions: Use the following questions to guide your discussion.

1. What patterns or trends did you observe in the student responses?
2. What standards/learning outcomes were evident in the student work?
3. What does the student work suggest about student strengths and areas for growth?
4. What does the student work suggest about the ways in which the assignment was able to elicit evidence for the various learning targets?

Chart your responses to these questions on poster paper to share with the whole group.

Part 2. Whole group share out (15 minutes)

Each group shares out their findings (15 minutes, approximately 5 minutes per group)

Discuss: What are the main implications of your analysis for the assignment?

Part 3. Evaluate the assignment (35 minutes)

In small groups (the same groups as in Part 1), use the **Common Assignment Study Unit Quality Rubric (Assessments and Evaluative Criteria)** to evaluate the quality of the common assignment and scoring criteria, identifying strengths and areas for improvement. (10 minutes)

Discuss: In what ways did using the Unit Quality Rubric to evaluate the common assignment confirm or refute your understanding of the unit's strengths and weaknesses? What, if anything, surprised you? (10 minutes)

Propose changes to the assignment (15 minutes)

Focus on:

- The standards and learning outcomes.
- The student-facing prompt and expectations.
- The scoring criteria used to assess the assignment (whether they evaluate disciplinary knowledge and skills).
- The texts/resources.

Part 4. Whole group share out and discussion (35 minutes)

Each group shares their proposed changes to the assignment/scoring criteria, and other participants provide feedback. (5 minutes per group)

Discuss: What are the implications for making changes to the unit? (20 minutes)

Consider the following questions.

- Do we have the right standards?
- Are the learning activities engaging?
- Are there sufficient opportunities for learning the content and practicing the skills?

EVIDENCE ALIGNMENT TOOL

Assignment Title: _____

Directions: Review each piece of student work, and decide whether the sample provides evidence of “minimal understanding,” “acceptable understanding,” or “strong understanding” of any of the standards or learning outcomes. Then, identify evidence from the student work that illustrates that level of understanding by quoting, citing examples, or describing what you observed. Indicate the sample number and the general location of the evidence in the sample (page/paragraph). Repeat for each sample.

Standards/Learning Outcomes	Evidence of Minimal Understanding	Evidence of Acceptable Understanding	Evidence of Strong Understanding
<p>CCSS ELA 11-12. Writing 1B. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly and thoroughly, supplying the most relevant evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience’s knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases.</p>	<p>Sample 3: Last ¶ mentions there are differing opinions on issue, but does not cite a specific counterclaim.</p> <p>Sample 5: No mention of a counterclaim.</p> <p>Sample 6: No mention of a counterclaim.</p>	<p>Sample 2: In ¶ 3, mentions counterclaim that social media decreases students’ interest in reading books. Cites the source of the counterclaim.</p> <p>Sample 4: In ¶ 4, cites evidence from article on Wikipedia that supports a counterclaim about social media supporting greater access to most current information.</p>	<p>Sample 1: In ¶ 4, discusses counterclaim that social media supports students’ awareness of social issues, cites author of OpEd in NYTimes, and dismisses counterclaim as limited to opinion and refutes counterclaim.</p>

Standards/Learning Outcomes	Evidence of Minimal Understanding	Evidence of Acceptable Understanding	Evidence of Strong Understanding