

## EQIP 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 EQIP 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) or a state's college- and career-ready (CCR) standards. 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 EQIP 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 or state's CCR standards*
- *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 or CCR-aligned lesson or unit. To provide the best opportunity for high quality feedback for a task, the developer(s) or teacher(s) should choose a task that is central to the learning goals of the lesson/unit. Then collect, and submit for review, multiple samples of student work that represent a range of learning levels.

### 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. The lesson/unit developer(s) may, or may not, be a member of a review team. When working as a team, discussion and collaboration are critical to the process. Each member of a team should independently record his or her findings and observations prior to team discussion. The review team's 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.

## 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 as reviewers begin this process to analyze 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.*

#### Guiding Questions:

- What content and performance demands does the task make on students?
- What is the purpose of the task?
- Which CCSS or your state's (CCR) Standards 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 English language arts (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 or your state developed CCR standards, 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 or State CCR Standards 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 for the task, not the samples of student work. 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 of the alignment between the targeted standards and the task.

<b>Full Alignment</b>	The expectations of the task address all aspects of the identified standard(s).
<b>Partial Alignment*</b>	The expectations of the task address the <i>most central</i> aspects of the identified standard(s). However, some of the <i>less central</i> aspects of the standard(s) may not be addressed (likely by design).
<b>Limited Alignment**</b>	The expectations of the task do NOT address the <i>most central</i> aspects of the identified standard(s). However, some of the <i>less central</i> aspects of the standard(s) are addressed.
<b>No Alignment</b>	The expectations of the task do not address the identified standard(s).

\* Partial alignment is possible when a standard contains multiple concepts and/or performances in a single standard. In these standards one part may play a more central role in the overarching requirements of the standard. It is possible, for example, that the requirements of one part subsume the requirements of the other part(s).

\*\* Limited alignment occurs when the most central aspects of standards containing multiple concepts and/or performances are not clearly addressed by the expectations of the task, but there is sufficient alignment to the less central aspects that continuing the review process is warranted. This could be the case if multiple standards are targeted and other standards have a strong alignment. Reviewers may want to suggest improvements to alignment.

*Note: If the task has no alignment with the lesson’s targeted standards, but is aligned to other 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 the 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?

- If the alignment for the task is partial or limited, which parts of the targeted

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

standard(s) are not addressed? What implications might this have?

**STEP 3: Analyze Individual Student Work.**

The reviewers examine the collected range of student responses to the task, first individually and then, in Step 4, as a group. The reviewers 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 their understanding of the task?
- What does the student's work demonstrate about the student's proficiency with the requirements of the targeted CCSS or CCR standards?
- 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?

*\*For ELA: This includes understanding of related texts and topics.*

*For mathematics: This means understanding the context of the question(s) and/or proficiency with the relevant Standards for Mathematical Practices.*

### Student Work Analysis Chart

Student Work Sample	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 level of proficiency with the requirements of the targeted CCSS or CCR standards?	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?
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, the reviewers analyze the whole collection of samples of student work, synthesizing the information in each column of the table used in Step 3. The reviewers use these questions to guide the review team’s discussion of the full collection of samples.

#### **Guiding Questions:**

- What aspects of the task have students generally performed well?
- What are the most frequent and fundamental problems students appear to have 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 collective understanding of the complexity of the text or the mathematical context?
- 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 “partial 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.**

The reviewers+ use insights from the review team’s analysis of the task and student work to suggest improvements the developer(s) might make to the task, instructional context, supporting materials and scoring guidelines/rubrics.

#### **Guiding Questions:**

- Are the task instructions clear to students? How could they be modified to increase student understanding of the task’s 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 a deeper reasoning and understanding?
- What modifications to the scoring guidelines/rubrics would improve guidance for evaluating student proficiency on the targeted standards?

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

