EQuIP Student Work Protocol

The ultimate goal of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) is to prepare all students with the knowledge and skills they need for postsecondary success. The EQuIP Student Work Protocol is designed to establish or articulate the relationship between student work and the quality and alignment of instructional materials that previously have been reviewed using the EQuIP quality review process. Focusing on this relationship enables educators to develop a common understanding of the challenging work required by the CCSS. Furthermore, analyzing this relationship will also assist in closing the gap between what students are learning and the expectations embodied in assignments, as well as verifying what students are being taught and what they have learned, remembered, and incorporated into their knowledge and skills. Common expectations will result in more equitable educational opportunities for students and deepen the existing foundation for collaboration among states and districts.

The specific objectives of this EQuIP Student Work Protocol are three-fold:

- To confirm that a lesson's or unit's assignment is aligned with the letter and spirit of the targeted Common Core State Standards.
- To determine how students performed on an assignment as evidence of how well designed the lesson/unit is.
- To provide criterion-based suggestions for improving the assignment and related instructional materials.

a) Where to find online:
To view and download the EQuIP Student Work Protocol and related training materials, please visit: www.achieve.org/equip

b) Who uses:
The EQuIP Student Work Protocol is designed for use by educators, instructional leaders and administrators.

c) Target materials:
The EQuIP Student Work Protocol is intended for use with instructional materials that have undergone an EQuIP review, received a rating of E or E/I, and then subsequently have been implemented in an instructional setting to produce samples of student work.

d) How to use:
This 5-step protocol begins with a team of reviewers (or a single reviewer) focusing on the assignment itself — the directions or prompt and any accompanying scoring guides. Reviewers identify the content and performances required by the assignment. Reviewers then analyze the standards actually targeted by the author of the lesson/unit and the content and performances they embody. Gaps in alignment are noted.

The process then turns to describing how students performed on the assignment and whether and how students demonstrated the expectations of the targeted standards. At the end of the review process, reviewers provide criterion-based feedback regarding improvements that could be made to both the assignment and related instructional materials.

EQuIP Student Work Protocol

Reviewer Name or ID: _____ Lesson/Unit Title: _____

Grade: _____ Content Area: _____ Task Title: _____

Student work can be a strong indicator of the quality of instructional materials. The EQuIP Student Work Protocol is a process for analyzing student responses to tasks for the purpose of evaluating the quality of the task and its alignment to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The protocol focuses on the quality of a single task within a lesson or unit and is a complement to reviews of the full lesson or unit using the EQuIP Quality Review Rubrics.

The Objectives

- *To analyze student work from a task within a lesson or unit to establish evidence of task alignment with the targeted CCSS.*
- *To provide suggestions for improving the task and related instructional materials.*

The Task

The task for which student work samples are collected should come from a CCSS-aligned[1] lesson or unit. It should be clearly written, including all diagrams, charts, graphs, and/or visuals. To provide the best opportunity for high quality feedback, the developer or teacher should choose a task that is central to the learning goals of the lesson/unit. The teacher or developer should then collect, and submit for review, multiple samples of student work that represent a range of student performance.

The Steps

Step 1: Analyze the Task
Step 2: Examine Instructional Context and CCSS Alignment of the Task
Step 3: Analyze Individual Student Work
Step 4: Analyze the Collection of Student Work
Step 5: Provide Suggestions for Improving the Materials

The Collaborative Process

While a single reviewer can apply the protocol, a team of reviewers is preferred. Only when working as a team, can discussion and collaboration, so critical to the process, occur. Each member of a team should independently record his or her findings and observations prior to discussion. Then discussion should focus on understanding all reviewers' analyses of both the task and the students' responses. For each step in the process the guiding questions should be used to stimulate and inspire, rather than to limit, discussion. Reviewers new to this process are encouraged to pause for discussion with each step. More experienced reviewers might choose to complete all five steps before beginning discussion.
The task/lesson/unit developer may, or may not, be a member of the review team.

[1] The *EQuIP Quality Review Rubrics* can be used to establish the quality and degree of alignment of a lesson or unit from which a task is selected.

Steps for the EQuIP Student Work Protocol

STEP 1: Analyze the Task.

The first step for a review team is to develop a focused understanding of the task itself. It is important to begin this process by analyzing what, precisely, the task is asking students to know and do.

- Record the grade, lesson/unit, and task title on the EQuIP Student Work Protocol Form.
- Use only the directions and prompts to analyze the requirements of the task without consulting the instructional context and supporting materials in the lesson/unit.
- Study the task thoroughly, making notes about its purpose and demands and noting apparent aligned standards. [For mathematics this requires actually working the problem(s) and answering the question(s) included in the task.]

Note: Reviewers should limit observations to what the task communicates about its purpose and demands. They will consider the instructional context, supporting materials, and scoring guidelines during Step 2. Throughout the process all discussions, observations, and recommendations should be based on evidence found in the student work, the task, and/or the lesson/unit.

Guiding Questions:

- What content and performance demands does the task make on students?
- What is the purpose of the task?
- Which CCSS seem to be targeted by the task?
- What types of student reasoning are required by the task?
- For mathematics: Which Standards for Mathematical Practice might be assessed by the task?
- For ELA: Are the complexity and nature of any associated texts appropriate for the task and grade level?

Note: If the task does not align to the CCSS, this process should be discontinued and feedback regarding the need for alignment should be provided to the developer.

Notes & Observations Regarding the Purpose and Demands of the Task:

STEP 2: Examine Instructional Context and CCSS Alignment of the Task.
After establishing a clear understanding of the nature and demands of the task, reviewers now look at the task in its instructional context. For this step reviewers should limit their analysis to the materials in the lesson/unit that support the teaching and learning of the required skills and knowledge. Student work samples will be analyzed individually in Step 3 and collectively in Step 4.

- Scan the entire lesson/unit noting its purpose, content, and organization.
- Notice the placement of the task within the context of the lesson/unit.
- Identify the standards targeted in the lesson/unit and compare to those identified by the reviewer(s) in Step 1.
- Examine the answer keys, scoring guidelines, and/or rubrics related to the task.

Alignment Descriptors: Use these descriptors in considering the quality and degree of the alignment between the targeted standards and the task.

Excellent	The task demands are clearly consistent with all aspects of the identified standard(s).
Strong	The task demands are consistent with the *most critical* aspects of the identified standard(s). However, some of the *less critical* aspects of the standard(s) may not be addressed (likely by design).
Weak	The task demands do NOT address the *most critical* aspects of the identified standard(s). However, some of the *less critical* aspects of the standard(s) are addressed.
No Alignment	The demands of the task do not match those of the identified standard(s).

Note: If the task is not aligned to the lesson's targeted CCSS, but is aligned to other CC standards, this process might continue but with feedback to the developer regarding the correct standards for alignment.

Guiding Questions:

- Where does the task occur within the instructional sequence? What have students already learned from the lesson/unit when they approach the task? What will they learn after?
- Does the lesson/unit include sufficient and effective instruction and scaffolding leading up to the task?
- Do the expectations described in the scoring guidelines correspond with your analysis of the task in Step 1?
- Is the task central to the learning goals of the lesson/unit?
- Which standards targeted in the lesson/unit match the content and performance demands of the task? (For mathematics, include the Standards for Mathematical Practice.)
- Do the directions, prompts, and/or scoring guidelines for the task adequately provide or indicate opportunities for students to demonstrate the requirements of the targeted standard(s) for the task?

[Step 2 cont.]

Notes & Observations Regarding the Instructional Context and Alignment of the Task:

STEP 3: Analyze Individual Student Work.

Examine the collected range of student responses to the task, first individually and then, in Step 4, as a group. Use the following chart to guide your analysis of each individual sample of student work, one sample for each row of the table. Use the questions at the top of each column to guide the review team's discussion of each individual student's response to the task:

Guiding Questions:

- What does the student's work demonstrate about his or her understanding of the task?
- What does the student's work demonstrate about his or her proficiency with the requirements of the targeted CCSS?
- What does the student's work demonstrate about the depth of his or her understanding and reasoning ability? *
- How does the application of the scoring guidelines/rubrics related to the task support an understanding of the student's proficiency?

*****_For ELA: This includes understanding any related texts and topics._
For math: This means understanding the context of the question(s) and/or proficiency with relevant Mathematical Practices.

Student Work Analysis Chart

Student Work Sample	What does the student's work demonstrate about their understanding of the task?	What does the student's work demonstrate about their proficiency with the requirements of the targeted CCSS?	What does the student's work demonstrate about the depth of their understanding and reasoning ability?	How does the application of the scoring guidelines/rubrics related to the task support an understanding of the student's proficiency?
Student #____				
Student #____				
Student #____				
Student #____				

Note: For a collection of more than four samples of student work, print this page multiple times.

Step 4: Analyze the Collection of Student Work.
After each sample has been individually considered, analyze the whole collection of samples of student work, synthesizing the information in each column of the table used in Step 3. Use these questions to guide the review team's discussion of the full collection of samples.

Guiding Questions:

- On what aspects of the task have students generally performed well?
- What are the most frequent and fundamental problems students appear to be having with the task? Are there common errors made across the collection of student work?
- What does the range of student work demonstrate about the clarity of the task, directions, and supporting materials?
- In what ways do the scoring guidelines/rubrics aid in the evaluation of student proficiency on the targeted standards?
- What do the patterns across multiple student work samples indicate about alignment of the task to the targeted standards?
- In what ways does the task allow (or not allow) students to demonstrate various levels of proficiency* with the targeted standards?
- Is there evidence of consistent levels of reasoning and understanding across the samples of student work?
- What does the pattern of student responses show about their understanding of the text or the mathematical context of the task?
- What are the implications of the findings for the collection of student work for further task development?

**Note: A range of student understanding of the requirements of the task and its targeted standards, from "proficient" to "deep conceptual understanding and reasoning," might be evident in the student work.*

Notes and Observations Regarding the Patterns Across the Student Work Samples:

STEP 5: Provide suggestions for improvement.

Use insights from analysis of the task and student work to suggest improvements developers might make to the task, instructional context, supporting materials and/or scoring guidelines/rubrics. All observations and suggestions should be based on, and have cited, evidence found in the student work, the task, and/or the lesson/unit.

Guiding Questions:

- Are the task instructions clear to students? How could they be modified to increase student understanding of the task expectations?
- Is the task properly placed within the overall lesson/unit plan? What modifications to instructional context might improve student performance?
- Does the task allow a variety of students to demonstrate their own level of proficiency? What modifications might be made to the task to elicit evidence of various levels of proficiency?
- Do the task prompts, directions, and requirements provide students with a clear opportunity to demonstrate proficiency of the targeted standards? What modifications to the task might elicit better evidence of proficiency on the targeted standards?
- Does the task allow students to demonstrate deep understanding and reasoning about the related concepts, topics, or texts? What modifications to the task might allow students to demonstrate the deep reasoning and understanding?
- What modifications to scoring guidelines/rubrics would improve guidance for evaluating student proficiency on the targeted standards?

Suggestions for Improvement for the Task and the Lesson/Unit: