

# PEER POWER Amplifying Student Voice



#### www.LeadingImpactTeams.com

paul@thecorecollaborative.com • Twitter: Bloomberg\_Paul

Extra Resources: bit.ly/ProvoImpactTeamsMarch2019

#### Starting with the End in Mind

The purpose of the Impact Team Model is to:

- Develop assessment capable learners 1.44 ES (effect size)
- Build collective teacher efficacy 1.57 ES

Observe the video and record strengths of the learner(s) and then make inference about the teaching.

Learner Strengths	Inferences About Inquiry

#### **Defining Impact Teams**

Impact Teams are **TEAMS** of educators who **PARTNER** with students. They **INNOVATE** to expand **STUDENT OWNERSHIP**. They **SCALE UP** their collective expertise to **MAKE A DIFFERENCE** for **ALL** students.

EVIDENCE	
What do I expe	ct to learn? Focus Standards   Learning Intentions and Success Criteria Metacognition Self-Regulation Executive Functioning Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Habits of Mind
ANALYSIS	
How will I know	I am learning? Self and Peer Assessment Feedback Monitoring my Learning Goals
ACTION	
How will I adjus	t my learning? Revision Refine my learning goals Practice new strategies to close the gap Celebrate progress
What will I do if	I already know it? Accelerate using the progression Go deep Apply my learning to a new context Celebrate success

Reflection | How would you define the Impact Team Model to stakeholders in your system?







#### EAA Classroom Protocol | The Formative Process in Action

#### Purpose

The EAA Classroom protocol is the heart of the Impact Team Model. The classroom protocol operationalizes the five core formative assessment practices. The three phases of the protocol combined, create a cycle of learning in which students and teachers partner together. Each phase of the protocol supports teachers in deep implementation of the formative assessment process. The length of each learning cycle is determined by curricular goals and student need.

The three-step framework, Evidence • Analysis • Action, is used to operationalize the formative assessment process into classroom culture. The classroom protocol leverages the following formative practices:

- Learning intentions
- Co-construction of success criteria
- $\circ$   $\hfill Self-$  and peer assessment with academic discourse
- Feedback
- $\circ \quad \text{Revision}$
- $\circ \qquad \text{Goal setting and reflection} \\$

Resources Needed	Time Needed
<ul> <li>Unpacked standards, rubrics, checklists</li> <li>Exemplars and samples of student work</li> <li>Curriculum documents</li> <li>Classroom peer feedback protocols         <ul> <li>Glow and Grow</li> <li>TAG Protocol</li> <li>Ladder of Feedback</li> <li>Critique Protocol</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>One class session or multiple class sessions</li> <li>Ongoing practice with the protocol is suggested</li> </ul>
Key Points	
<ul> <li>Formative assessment is a process NOT</li> <li>The classroom protocol increases feedbat</li> <li>Engages students in answering (1) Where next?</li> </ul>	a product ck to learners e am I going? (2) How am I going? (3) What's

Efficacy Connections

- **Mastery Experiences:** Students gain mastery experiences when they have time to practice and master critical learning goals.
- **Models of Success:** Teacher teams frame models of success so students can learn vicariously through each other.
- Feedback: Increases feedback from multiple sources.
- **Safety:** Students need a safe environment to take risks while practicing new material. Students need to feel safe to fail and feel safe when being challenged.

EAA Classroom Implementation Rubric | Formative Assessment Process in Action

	MN	Σ	
(1) EVIDENCE			
Learning Intentions and Success Criteria			
Students can articulate learning intentions and success criteria.			
Students engage in co-construction of the success criteria with their classmates and teacher.			
Students can identify success criteria in student work samples and exemplars.			
Students reflect regularly using essential questions connected to big ideas.			
Assessment Tools	-		
Criteria-based tasks are developed and are aligned to the focus standards (check-lists, rubrics).			
Exemplars are annotated by success criteria and are visible to students (note-books, LMS, classroom environment).			
Samples of student work are used to clarify success criteria.			
(2) ANALYSIS	-		
Peer and Self-Assessment, Feedback			
Students use rubrics and/or check-lists when engaged in self-assessment and peer-assessment.			
Students get regular practice applying the success criteria.			
Students can identify success criteria in each other's work.			
Students can give and receive feedback based on the success criteria in a respectful manner.			
Students engage in reflective dialogue with peers and teacher based on rubrics and/or checklists.			
Students get regular feedback from teacher to lift the accuracy of their self- and peer assessments.			
(3) ACTION			
Goal Setting, Revision, Feedback, Tracking System			
Students reflect on their strengths and next steps based on feedback from peer and self-assessment and teacher.			
Students create SMARTER personal learning goals based on feedback.			
Students revise assessment based on feedback tied to rubric and/or checklist.			
Students keep track of their progress and mastery of Focus Standards (they have a way to organize their learning).			

Unpacking for Success Wiki: www.thecorecollaborative.com/unpackng

#### **Unpacking for Success | Getting to Know Focus Standards**

#### Purpose

Impact Teams meet to collaboratively get to know the standards at a deep level. Based on their collective understanding, they develop learning intentions and success criteria for products, performances, and strategies relative to school and district focus standards. They plan backwards from the learning intention to develop cohesive units, increase clarity for students, and to connect daily instruction to the learning intention (standard or strategy).

The three-step framework, Evidence • Analysis • Action, is followed for team meetings to

- o Deeply understand the standards through collaborative research of the standards
- Determine cognitive rigor using DOK, Bloom's, and/or SOLO
- Increase clarity on the learning progression
- Determine big idea(s) and essential question(s)
- o Align success criteria to products and performances
- o Interpret the standard in student-friendly language (this can be done along-side students)
- Connect daily instruction to the learning intention
- o Design formative assessment rubrics and/or checklists that align to products and performances
- Determine strategies that support students in creating standards-based products or performances
- Design standards-based lesson plans

Resou	rces Needed	Time Needed
	Resources to "get to know" the standards www.thecorecollaborative.com/unpacking Access to shared team folder: unpacked standard, team notes, criteria-based task, pacing guides, etc. Rubric templates, lesson planning templates Projection or Cloud Drive	o 45–60 Minutes
Key Po	ints	
	The unpacking process is a collaborative process that standards. Reviewing unpacking documents is key to strengthen Teacher clarity is increased through unpacking collab The unpacking process can vary depending on conte Many teams have to increase clarity with multiple set	it should be done for all focus ning clarity across the team. poratively; it yields a .75 effect. In being unpacked. s of standards.
Efficac	y Connections	
0	<b>Models of Success:</b> During the unpacking process, to increase clarity for students.	many teams co-construct exemplars
0	Feedback: Success criteria are created for standards	s-based products and performances.
0	<b>Safety:</b> When teachers have clarity and have a clear lowers anxiety for the team resulting in a feeling of sa	picture of the criteria for success it afety.

NM = Not Met M=Met

Unpacking for Success   Getting to Know Focus Standards	
	MN
(1) EVIDENCE	
Team researches the standard(s)—(open source, published books, released test items, etc.).	
Team shares notes based on the research.	
(2) ANALYSIS	
Skills and Concepts	
Team determines essential skills (verbs).	
Team determines concepts (nouns).	
DOK Rationale	-
Team determines cognitive rigor of the standard (ceiling) using Web's DOK Guides / Hess Cognitive Rigor Matrix / Solo Taxonomy.	
Team determines rationale for task(s) utilizing the DOK Assessment Tool.	
Team discusses length of time needed to teach standard to mastery based on DOK.	
Learning Progression	
Team tracks the progression of standards across grades (standards that come before and standards that come after).	
Team takes notes and discusses the progression.	
Relevance	
Team determines the big idea(s) and essential questions.	
Team brainstorms relevant products, performances, and processes.	
(3) ACTION	
Develop Key Competencies	
Team brainstorms key competencies connected to the standard(s).	
Team makes connections to other standards and refines key competencies.	
Team sequences key competencies.	
Develop Criteria-Based Tasks, Strategies, and Learning Intentions	
Team generates possible learning intentions grounded in product, performance, and process.	
Team develops formative tasks (products and/or performances) based on competencies—assigns success criteria.	
Team records strategies and processes to teach standards—assigns process-based success criteria.	
Team revises and revises tasks and rubrics.	

9

## **The Peer Review Process**

1 Define the Criteria
2 Model a Peer Feedback Structure
Glow & Grow
TAG TAG
Ladder of Feedback
Critique Protocol
3 Feedback on Feedback
4 Revision, Goal Setting
The What (use the success criteria)
The How (the strategy used to close the gap)

#### Success Criteria | Brainstorm Examples of Each

PRODUCT	PERFORMANCE
PROCESS or STRATEGY	BEHAVIOR

#### **Co-Construction of Success Criteria | 4 Step Process**

BRAINSTORM	SORT & CATEGORIZE
REFINE, ALIGN, REVISE	DESIGN RUBRIC

Brainstorm effective methods to co-construct success criteria with students

## Success Criteria Challenges and Concerns

Challenges or Concerns	Considerations
<b>Time-Consuming:</b> Co-constructing criteria with students can be time-consuming. Some teachers might find it difficult to justify the time it takes to co-construct the criteria.	<ul> <li>Have students discuss what they learned or what doing the learning activities "looks like".</li> <li>Highlight and integrate assessment language and skills into all learning experiences.</li> <li>Share with students up front what you are doing with criteria, and why.</li> <li>Begin small and build on success and engagement.</li> <li>Begin slow and let the momentum drive the learning.</li> <li>Practice with generating criteria will improve the rate and the quality of the exercise.</li> </ul>
Inquiry: Sharing learning goals and success criteria at the outset of learning may not be possible for inquiry and problem-solving activities.	<ul> <li>Students may record success criteria "en route" as they progress through their inquiry/investigation.</li> <li>Poster paper or sticky notes can be used to record potential success criteria as they are identified during the inquiry. Consensus can be reached following the investigation.</li> <li>An exit card requiring each student to write a learning goal for the inquiry and a number of success criteria will help the teacher assess who has learned what.</li> <li>Alternatively, in groups of four, use a mix and match: Each student records one distinct criterion on a piece of paper. Pairs of students from each group rotate, visiting very other group, and gather similar success criteria to their own that might belong to the same category. Following the mix and match, all return to their home group, name the category, list the criteria on poster paper, and post them for all to see. Students and teacher share their recommendations and questions prior to coming to consensus.</li> </ul>

## Success Criteria Challenges and Concerns

Challenges or Concerns	Considerations
Lack of Prior Knowledge: Students may not have the prior knowledge or experience to be able to generate criteria for a learning task or goal.	<ul> <li>Success criteria can be generated in different ways.</li> <li>Begin with tasks or processes that are familiar to students.</li> <li>Choose simple tasks that make the criteria transparent.</li> <li>Invite students to begin to identify "look-fors" during their learning.</li> <li>Model using the criteria early in the learning cycle.</li> <li>Provide exemplars, samples, and anchors to help students identify success criteria.</li> <li>Develop checklists or rubrics for use in modelling and practicing using the criteria.</li> </ul>
Limit Creativity: Showing students samples of work may limit creativity or encourage imitation.	<ul> <li>Align the tasks with the success criteria and the learning goal(s).</li> <li>Ensure assessment tasks provide the evidence you require.</li> <li>Open up the possibilities and use a diversity of samples.</li> <li>Incorporate "originality and creativity" as a success category if applicable.</li> <li>Provide open-ended tasks and choice in how students demonstrate their learning.</li> </ul>

From the Assessment for Learning Video Series Guide: http://bit.ly/2MoCyNW

U	Give your partner a suggestion for improvement.	<ul> <li>&gt; I think focusing on</li></ul>
A	Ask a question related to the learning intention.	<ul> <li>Can you help me understand</li> <li>Can you clarify</li> <li>I wonder why</li> </ul>
	Tell your partner team something they did well.	<ul> <li>→ I like how you</li> <li>→ As a reader, it was enjoyable when you</li> <li>→ I was impressed with</li> <li>→was a strength.</li> </ul>

**DIEAMS** 

### **Goal Setting Checklist**

- □ We have taught students how to set goals
- U We have taught students how to monitor goals
- □ We give students feedback on their goals
- □ We design and deliver lessons that support social and emotional learning and how to manage our emotions throughout the learning process
- □ Students can speak to their goals and prove their goals
- □ We have goal setting process established
  - o What our strengths and next steps are
  - How we will improve (cognitive and metacognitive strategies)
  - o Habits of mind needed to be successful
  - Who I can study or partner with
- □ Rituals regarding goal setting are established
  - Weekly Support
  - o Short Term Goals
  - o Long Term Goals
  - o Time to practice if goals have not been met
- □ We have co-constructed success criteria for KEY habits of mind
- □ Student reference habits of mind during self, peer assessment and goal setting
- □ Students are empowered to support others in the classroom
  - o Show Me Video
  - Video Tutorials
  - Student-Led Strategy Groups
  - Peer Tutoring
  - o CREW

## Impact Team Success Criteria

Impact Team Foundational Components	NY	S	Α		
School Climate					
Our teams use strategies to decrease stress while promoting self-care and wellness for all.					
Social-emotional learning & behavioral intentions are co-constructed with students.					
Our team utilizes proactive practices related to student behavior & social-emotional learning.					
Students are taught techniques to take responsibility for their emotions and behavior.					
Our team identifies & implements practices so all demographic & identity groups feel					
affirmed, validated, and accepted.					
Teaming to Learn					
We have established learning teams. (course-alike, vertical, etc.)					
Our team agrees and commits to expanding student ownership and agency.					
Our team uses protocols purposefully to guide team meetings.					
Our team meets weekly for 45-60 minutes.					
Our team has a trained peer facilitator that can facilitate purposeful protocols.					
The peer facilitator participates in job-embedded professional learning monthly.					
Our team receives feedback on our collaborative practices & Impact Team Inquiry Cycle.					
Formative Assessment in Action					
Our classroom practices are based on the notion that teachers partner with students in the					
learning process (trust is high).					
Learning intentions & success criteria are clearly communicated to students.					
Students receive evidence-based feedback based on success criteria.					
Students use self and peer assessment as sources of feedback.					
Students set goals and revise their work using success criteria from formative tasks.					
Curriculum: Equitable, Viable, Coherent					
Our team works to ensure curriculum & instruction is culturally proficient and responsive.					
We have determined focus standards that are vertically aligned across grades/courses.					
We have determined the time needed to teach & learn the focus standards.					
Our team has organized & sequenced the focus standards coherently to maximize learning opportunities.					
Our team has unpacked the focus standards and has developed student friendly rubrics,					
check-lists, and tools to support self-peer assessment and goal setting.					
Our team ensures that the curriculum is accessible to all students.					
Evidence to Inform and Act					
Our team analyzes student work regularly to inform and act.					
Our team triangulates data to determine impact. (student voice, student work, diagnostic, etc.)					
Our team monitors on-going implementation of the formative process.					
Our team analyzes student voice data to ensure that every student's dignity is honored.					
Strengthening Efficacy					
Our school intentionally plans for ways to build student, teacher, and collective efficacy.					
Our school analyzes data regarding relational trust to build a positive learning culture.					
Teachers are knowledgeable about one another's strengths.					
Teachers co-construct school goals with leadership.					
Leadership uses a strength-based approach to build a strong learning culture.					
Leadership demonstrates vulnerability to strengthen relational trust.					
Our school uses effective intervention systems to support all students.					



#### REFERENCES

- Ames, C., & Ames, R. (1984). Systems of student and teacher motivation: Toward a qualitative definition. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *76*(4), 535–556.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998a). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. doi:10.1080/0969595980050102
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998b). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *80*(2), 139–144, 146–148.
- Bloomberg, P., & Pitchford, B. (2016). *Leading impact teams Building a culture of efficacy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Brookhart, S. M., Andolina, M., Zuza, M., & Furman, R. (2004). Minute math: An action research study of student self-assessment. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 57(2), 213–227. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EDUC.0000049293.55249.d4
- Chappuis, S., & Stiggins, R. (2002). Classroom assessment for learning. *Educational Leadership*, 60(1), 40–43.
- Clarke, S. (2001). Unlocking formative assessment: Practical strategies for enhancing pupils' learning in the primary classroom. Philadelphia, PA: Trans-Atlantic.
- Cooper, D. (2006). Collaborating with students in the assessment process. *Orbit*, 36(2), 20–23.
- Crooks, T. J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. *Review of Educational Research, 58*(4), 438–481.
- Cyboran, V. (2006). Self-assessment: Grading or knowing? *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, *10*(3), 183–186.
- Dewett, T. (2007). Linking intrinsic motivation, risk taking, and employee creativity in an R & D environment. *R & D Management*, 37(3), 197–208.
- Ferguson, Y., & Sheldon, K. M. (2010). Should goal-strivers think about 'why' or 'how' to strive? *Motivation and Emotion*, *34*(3), 253–265.
- Gallimore, R., Emerling, B., Saunders, W., & Goldenberg, C. (2009). Moving the learning of teaching closer to practice: Teacher education implications of school-based inquiry teams. *Elementary School Journal, The Chicago Press Journals, 109*(5), 537–553.
- Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. Retrieved from https://www.visiblelearningplus.com/sites/default/files/Feedback%20article.pdf

#### REFERENCES

- Kreibig, S. D., Gendolla, G. H. E., & Scherer. K. R. (2010). Psychophysiological effects of emotional responding to goal attainment. *Biological Psychology*, 84(3), 474–487.
- Lepper, M. R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic rewards: a test of the over justification hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28(1), 129–137.
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in school: Translating research into action.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Paulson, F. L., Paulson, P. R., & Meyer, C. A. (1991). What makes a portfolio a portfolio? *Educational Leadership*, 48(5), 60–63.
- Robinson, V. (2011). Student-Centered Leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Rolheiser, C., & Ross, J. (2000). Student self-evaluation: What do we know? *Orbit*, *30*(4), 33–36.
- Rolheiser, C., Bower, B., & Stevahn, L. (2000). *The portfolio organizer: Succeeding with portfolios in your classroom*. Alexandra, VA: ASCD.
- Ross, J. A. (2006). The reliability, validity, and utility of self-assessment. *Practical* Assessment Research & Evaluation, 11(10), 1–13.
- Ross, J. A., Rolheiser, C., & Hogaboam-Gray, A. (1999). Effects of self-evaluation training on narrative writing, *Assessing Writing*, 6(1), 107–132. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/S1075-2935(99)00003-3
- Sadler, R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. Instructional Science: as cited in Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box, Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139–144, 146–148.
- Schunk, D. H., & Rice, J. M. (1991). Learning goals and progress feedback during reading comprehension instruction. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 23(3), 351–364.
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189.
- Skipper, Y., & Douglas, K. (2012). Is no praise good praise? Effects of positive feedback on children's and university students' responses to subsequent failures. *Psychology*, 82(2), 327–339.
- White, B. Y., & Frederiksen, J. R. (1998). Inquiry, modeling, and metacognition: Making science accessible to all students. *Cognition and Instruction*, *16*(1), 3–118.
- Wiliam, D. (2011). Embedded formative assessment. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (1999). Acquiring writing revision skill: Shifting from process to outcome self-regulatory goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*(2), 241–250.