

LISA/CONNIE: read comments on the side to note the needed next steps.  
I can help as needed!

<b>School Name</b>	Brighten Academy
<b>Date of Protocol</b>	May 23 2016
<b>Participants</b> (Name and Role)	All faculty

Based on today's protocol, what conclusions did you draw about the level of quality displayed in the student work?

### Strengths

- C'y (2 higher order literacy, 2 Transfer of understanding) and a'y (creative thinking of students) holding hands
- A'y (4real world issues, controversy, 2 local people and places,)
- C'y (2 exploring multiple perspectives)
- A'y (2 contributes to larger community)
- C'p (beautiful in conception)
- A'y (formats and standards from pro world)

### Areas to Develop

MS: a'y: 2 contributing to larger community

C'p: 2 accuracy (maybe)

C'p: accuracy in citing sources/standards from professional world/c'y (higher order thinking)

C'y: 2connections to big concepts within disciplines (math)

A'y: 3formats/standards from pro world

A'y: original creative thinking/ideas (in or out of context of research)

C'y: transfer of understanding

**Based on today's protocol, what conclusions did you draw about the tasks and scoring tools that teachers are designing?**

**Strengths**

C'y--rubrics were based on grade level standards, 3 higher order literacy skills

C'p: 4 rubrics demanded accuracy, detail, beauty

Rubrics feature spelling (to what extent is this craftsmanship)

**Areas to develop**

A'y: more personal voice or ideas showing up in tasks/tools

A'y: rubrics leave little room for original student thinking

A'y: task descriptors naming connection to larger community/real world issue

C'y: some rubrics have lots of subjectivity; rubrics don't capture "transfer of understanding"

Refine and align our ideas about c'p

A'y: 2 rubrics including larger purpose

C'y: multiple perspectives in assessment tools

**Based on these conclusions, what goals and action steps did you determine?**

Goal	Action Steps/Dates

<b>Which student work, representative of school-wide quality, will you be archiving from this protocol?</b> <b>1.2nd:</b>  <b>2.3rd</b>  <b>3.5th</b>  <b>4. 8th</b>	
<b>Which student work, if any, will you be submitting to EL's Center for Student Work?</b>	

## Quality Work Protocol Summary Sheet

May 2015 Summary sheet [Attributes](#)

<b>School Name</b>	<b>Brighten Academy</b>
<b>Date of Protocol</b>	<b>Dec 10 2015</b>
<b>Participants (Name and Role)</b>	Leadership Team: Lisa McDonald, Connie Arnold, Katie Derringer, Corinne Dowd, Amy Witcher, Laura Rogers, Audra Shelton, Sarah Boddy, Tajuan White, Suzanne Helms, Sue Beck, Heather Pardue, Kelly Cadman
<p><b>Based on today's protocol, what conclusions did you draw about the level of quality displayed in the student work?</b></p> <p><i>Note: This protocol a mix of short and longer-term. So, insofar as one can look at any piece of student work through the lens of craftsmanship, complexity, and authenticity, we were able to use those lenses on all the work, though it was harder to pull out patterns given the range of products.</i></p> <p><b><u>strengths</u></b></p> <p><b>complexity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● use of evidence and problem solving (higher-order literacy skills), showing understanding through writing</li> </ul> <p><b>authenticity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● students' thinking and original ideas</li> </ul> <p><b>craftsmanship:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● evidence of multiple drafts and higher level vocab than anticipated</li> <li>● craftsmanship: attention to detail in conventions (accurate spelling and punctuation, better handwriting)</li> <li>● craftsmanship: incorporation of feedback in multiple drafts</li> <li>● craftsmanship: care in organization and formatting</li> </ul>	

**Areas to improve/focus on:**

**complexity:** multiple perspectives, connections to big concepts

**craftsmanship:** deepening details and accuracy beyond conventions. Supporting more than accuracy in math work.

**authenticity:** audience; connecting academic standards with real-world issues, people and places; formats and standards from the professional world.

**Based on today's protocol, what conclusions did you draw about the tasks and scoring tools that teachers are designing?**

Tasks and tools were not always present. Tasks were more short-term, and were generally not designed around issues/formats from the world outside school. Rubrics tended towards deeper connections to content standards/skills, quantitative ("three facts" vs. "relevant evidence") measures, and craftsmanship in terms of conventions and editing.

**Based on these conclusions, what goals and action steps did you determine?**

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Action Steps/Dates</b>
To have task/product descriptors (for tasks that demand elements of complexity, craftsmanship, and authenticity) complete before launching tasks with students	-January 18: Sarah will take pictures at Oakhurst's QWP -Feb: Sarah will share photos of work and hopefully tasks/tools -Feb 25: peer review task/product descriptors through lenses of "attributes of high quality work"
To increase the qualitative aspects of assessment tools (moving from "three facts" to "relevant evidence"), reflective of the task's demands of elements of high quality work)	-peer review assessment tools for connections to task/product descriptors and to the elements of high-quality work. And qualitiveness!

**Which student work, representative of school-wide quality, will you be archiving from this protocol?**

- 8th grade characterization silhouettes
- 8th grade The Giver project (character analysis)
- 4th grade narrative ("Wizaria")
- 6th grade Virtual Field Trip to Amazon River
- 6th grade math project on integers

5th grade compare/contrast John Brown/Harriet Beecher Stowe/Harriet Tubman with reflection  
2nd grade History of Native American Tribes  
2nd grade opinion writing on Native Americans

**Which student work, if any, will you be submitting to EL's Center for Student Work?**

1.

2.

3.