Analysis of Students' Learning and Evaluation of Assessment Tool

Collect evidence of student learning:

- 1. Collect all students' work for one class of students on at least one of the assessments you created for EDTEP 573 (performance assessment or test/quiz). Complete the analysis chart using the work from the whole class (see directions below).
- 2. Collect student voice evidence from all students in the same class (one exit slip for instruction and one for students' reflection on their assessment performance).
- 3. Select student work samples and student voice evidence from 5 students who show different patterns of response. If possible, at least one student should have an IEP, be an English learner, or be a student who needs extra instructional support. Scan, photograph, or provide video of the selected students' performances/written work to submit with this reflection.
- 4. Use the selected work samples to anchor your written responses to the prompts below.

Analysis of student learning:

Complete the analysis chart on Page 3.

- List the learning objectives/standards that were targeted by the assessment in the first column. Use as much space and as many rows as you need.
- In the relevant boxes, describe, in some detail, the quality of work you expected to see that exceeds expectations, meets expectations, approaches expectations, or needs more/different instruction or support for each of the targeted objectives/standards. If appropriate, you may use the language of the scoring rubric you developed for the assessment.
- Using *all* the student work from one whole class, identify the percent of students in the class who did work at each level of performance for each objective.

Make sense of the patterns of overall student performance – what each level of performance looks like for each objective reported in the chart. In your analysis report, **reflect and discuss** the following:

- Summarize the patterns in what you *actually* saw in student responses across all of the objectives/standards and what you found in the student voice evidence. Use specific student work samples (from the selected 5) to support details in the summary. Use student voice evidence to support your analysis.
- What might be explanations in terms of your instruction or student prior knowledge for the patterns that you see?
- What are the next steps in instruction based on the patterns you see? Be sure that the next steps are focused on improvement of student learning with respect to the learning objectives/standards based on the assessment data and your analysis of students' work.

Analysis Chart

Targeted Objective(s)/ Standard(s)	Descriptive Characteristics of Student Work			
	Needs more/different instruction or support	Approaches expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations
Students will learn how authors use character to communicate ideas.	Students recalled concrete details that had little to do with character development over time and did not connect details to the real world.	Students either only recalled concrete examples from the film or only provided commentary of how characters developed over time without concrete details. (They did not connect the details to <i>why</i> the author may have included them) Their connections to the real world were present but vague	Students recalled concrete examples from the film involving characters and explained their development over time. They also compared details to the real world.	Students recalled concrete examples from the film involving characters and their development and provided analysis of how that affected the film as a whole. They also applied their ideas to the real world.
	_6% of class	_20% of class	_65% of class	_9% of class
Students will learn characteristics of a social justice film.	Students recognized the words of "stereotype" and "prejudice" but could not match them to their manifestations in the film.	Students understood the word "stereotype" and its manifestations in the film along with one of the other three key terms. They still were confused by the last two/distracted by other words in word bank.	Students understood stereotypes, prejudices, oppression and their manifestations within the film. They confused the meanings of equity and social justice.	Students understood stereotypes, prejudices, oppression, and social justice and their context within the film. More so, they did not confuse the meanings of equity and social justice.
	6% of class	_63% of class	_25% of class	_6% of class

Note: The other two objectives covered in the test were only found in the multiple choice questions. While I considered the questions that caused problems and which incorrect answer was most frequently selected and how that reflects student learning for the class as a whole, I did not think the scale of "needs more instruction" to "exceeds expectations" was as fitting for MC questions.

Reflection

In my class of 31 (21 girls, 10 boys, 4 recent graduates from the ELL program) 11 students earned A's, 8 students earned B's, 7 students earned C's, and 5 students earned D's on my unit exam. I consider the fact that 0 students failed the test a small sign of success for both my first unit planning and my students' progress in learning. Because the overall grades of an exam does not provide the most in depth representation of student learning, my analysis of the individual objectives present within the exam follows.

The first objective that was covered most thoroughly in the exam was "students will learn how authors use character to communicate ideas." Two short answer questions and one performance item (in the form of compare/contrast analysis between a nonfiction text and the film *Finding Forrester*) all dealt with this objective. The two short answers were virtually the same—write two ways a character changed and cite an example from the film for each—except one focused on the young, African American protagonist, Jamal, and the other, the older, white author, William. Most of my students excelled at these questions. They came up with two different changes in each character and could cite concrete evidence from the film. Some students could only do so for Jamal's character and not William's, as seen in student A's paper on page 17. He answered Jamal's question with two distinct changes ("getting bad grades to getting good grades" and describing his motivations changing to prove himself to Professor Crawford) and events in the film that supported it. However, for William's question, he wrote,

"William's actions changed from not caring about anything so he goes with it to thinking about what he's doing. He went into William's apartment as a dare from his friends but ends up going to apologize for it. His relationship changed with William. From stealing from him to going for visits to friends."

Confusing pronouns aside, this response does include some events that occurred in the film, but they all still centered around Jamal. Jamal broke into William's house. Jamal apologizes and begins to visit William. As such, these details do not show a change in William's character. If I only had this response to judge, I may think there was a confusion in what the question was asking. However, because he responded so appropriately to the question before when it did focus on Jamal, I believe this student and others like him had a harder time following William's character development. This may be because it was harder to relate to him or because his changes were more internal than external. In the future, I will focus more time on discussing secondary characters' actions and motivations and challenge my students to look more closely at changes that occur which may not be the most obvious. These changes may include a shift in values or perspectives.

With the performance assessment piece of the test, students were required to read a shortened version of JD Salinger's obituary and identify two similarities and two differences between him and William. Again, most of my students did very well on this section. Most focused on similarities such as "they both lived in isolation/were recluses" and "they both wrote novels they did not publish." These are two main elements of William's character in the film and facts that propel the plot and influence the conflict. The examples of differences ranged from specific, minute details—JD died at 91 and William was in his 70s—to major differences between the two men like marital status/children and the fact that William left his

reclusion before he died. Most students were able to draw connections between the fictional character of William to the real life author, Salinger. This piece of the test also allowed students to bring in their funds of knowledge with their talking to the text notes. As seen in Student B's work on page 31, she commented "I hate divorces" in the second to last paragraph that mentions JD's divorce in 1967. This manifested itself in one of her differences, "Another difference between the two of them was William enjoyed the rest of his years going to places while JD isolated himself again after the divorce."

For the characteristics of a social justice film objective, students were given four sentences that featured examples of their four vocabulary words—stereotypes, prejudice, oppression, and social justice—and how they manifested themselves in the film. All but two of my students recognized the example of stereotype and correctly filled in the blank. Many of them also recognized prejudice, but some got its definition mixed up with oppression. Eight students correctly identified stereotypes, prejudice, and oppression but wrote "equity" (a distraction word) as opposed to "social justice" in the final blank. I realized while grading that I once briefly mentioned the word equity as being synonymous with social justice, and because equity would work in the blank, I decided to allow that answer as well. Once I made that adjustment, about 1/3 of the students got full credit on that section with the majority only missing one or two. For the two students who did correctly identify all four words, it is very possible they only did so because we covered those specific words in detail twice, and they knew "that would be on the test." In the future, I will be more explicit with meanings of words and not include distractor words that are so close, they are also correct. More so, I will provide opportunities during lessons for *students* to identify manifestations of big ideas like oppression through the texts we read before I give my interpretations.

The Coming of Age question was by far the most varied in responses. Part of this stemmed from the fact that we only discussed it once during class (while every other objective was covered in the review session the day before the exam.) Some students wrote three words, "loss of innocence," and received full credit because that was an exact example we talked about in class, and I did not ask for complete sentences. Others wrote entire paragraphs that either analyzed in detail the similarities between the two Coming of Age stories we discussed in class (so they did not pin point a characteristic that applied to ALL Coming of Age stories). Conversely, some wrote vague descriptions of events that occur in most stories so it was not unique to Coming of Age ones, such as student C "One characteristic that happens is there is always something very important that happens that either makes something really bad or it makes something very important." Because a slight majority of my students missed this question, I believe I did not cover this subject well enough the first time. I will need to readdress it during the next unit that involves a Coming of Age story so they see it is more synonymous with "growing up."

Reflection on Assessment

Overall, I believe my test aligned well with my objectives. None of the questions strayed from objectives, and the students performed above average on this exam. The Coming of Age question, though aligned with the objective, made it clear that I did not cover that topic well enough in class. Part of the problem was the idea of "characteristic." Many students asked what that meant during the test. I will know to spend more time on genre descriptions and what characteristics of said genres include. It will be important to stress that characteristics are things that apply to most stories within that genre, not just one or two examples.

I also realized that I did not spend nearly enough time on the idea of "social justice." I introduced it in the very first lesson before watching the film and in the review session before the exam, but no time between them. Stereotypes, prejudices, and oppression all came up in discussion throughout the unit, so most students had a better idea of those meanings. By including a word that is very close in meaning to social justice and not spending enough time on such a higher level concept, it was unfair of me to expect my students to know the difference between the two. In the future, I would not include two such similar words unless I explicitly discussed the difference between them.

The multiple choice questions that dealt with setting and plot were also aligned with the objectives and relatively well written. Most of the students got 3-4 out of 4 on that section, so it was clearly content they learned. However, 11 out of the 12 incorrect answers were selected if you include the test results from my other classes. As such, I believe they were also viable options. They question most often missed revolved around why the author chose to set the film in the Bronx. During the lesson, I emphasized the diversity of the Bronx as it was juxtaposed with the homogeneous setting of Mailor-Callow. However, many student selected the option that said, "The Bronx was the most racist neighborhood in New York." Though this is not supported in the film since most of the racism that is present occurs in other areas of New York, it implies students were considering the broader themes present in the film. These themes

were further developed during the short answer questions, which allowed students to present a fuller range of knowledge and ideas with their analysis of character change throughout the film.

Analysis of Student Work

What was most interesting about this unit is the varied responses I got from student throughout and afterward. For instance, on a survey ranging from "strongly disagree" to strongly agree," all but one of my students marked "agree" or "strongly agree" to the statement, "I have a firm understanding of stereotypes, prejudices, and oppression." This surprised me because a fair amount of them missed at least one question on the exam. While the survey did not mention social justice (because as mentioned before, I realized I did not cover that idea fully), I believe part of their confidence stems from my students understanding the ideas of the words. When asked about their meanings, many drew connections to the spelling of words, "Oppression is when people in power, like, press down on the other people who don't have the power" or "prejudice is when someone pre-judges a person before getting to know them." These comments make me believe that perhaps they just need to practice identifying these abstract ideas as they are manifested in literature.

Some of the feedback I found most interesting were from students such as student D on page 7. She wrote that she agrees she has a better understanding of character, setting, and plot (Goal 1), she strongly agrees that she has a firm understanding of the social justice terms (Objective 2.1), and she agrees that the paragraph and test accurately reflected her understanding (of the film and the Jane Schafer method—Goal 3). However, she did not learn a lot from the jigsaw and Socratic seminar, she did not feel like the unit gave her a chance to express her thoughts, and she would not choose to use the Jane Schafer method again because it confused her. From student responses like this, it seems that they did not fully enjoy the unit, but they still managed to learn something from it. Many of these students are more reserved and typically get A's on assignments. However, some students strongly agreed with the statement about the jigsaw and Socratic seminar and felt like they did not have a firm understanding of the goals. I noticed that these students seemed to be the more outgoing students and several of them have lower grades in my class. It is hard, then, to decide if I should continue using jigsaws and Socratic seminars. If the majority of my students do not feel like they learned from them, is it worth it to have the whole class participate in activities that only benefit a few students, albeit ones that probably need more engagement?

While learning and practicing the Jane Schafer method, I also passed out an exit slip that asked students to identify what the learning objective was, assess how they thought they were doing at meeting it, and provide an example of how they can get closer to completing the objective. Some students, such as student E on page 5 keyed in on specific aspects of the paragraph with which they were struggling. "Try to improve the commentary part, because I struggle with stating my opinion." Many responded with ideas like, "I could practice more, and you could provide more examples." Commentary seemed to be the most common piece that students struggled with creating. For the next writing piece we do, I plan to model coming up with commentary. While I provided them with two different paragraph examples that included solid commentary, I think the actual process of thinking through concrete details and how they prove a topic sentence seems daunting, and I want to show the students it is often a messy ordeal. But, that messiness can turn into great, original commentary once reworked a few times.