



Quality Work Protocol Summary Sheet

School Name	King Middle School
Date of Protocol	February 4th, 2015
Participants (Name and Role)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Catherine Bursk (gr.7 Sci) 2. Sue Carlson (gr.6/7 Sp. Ed) 3. Joseph Charnley (Span) 4. Paul Clifford (gr.8 SS) 5. Elaine Colella (gr.8 LA) 6. Scott Comstock (gr.7 Sci Comm) 7. Patricia Crowley-Rockwell (Asst. Principal) 8. Erika Dyhrberg (gr.7 SS) 9. Amelia Eshleman (gr.8 Sp. Ed) 10. Joseph Farrell (music) 11. Mark Gervais (gr.8 SS) 12. Gus Goodwin (gr.8 Tech Ed) 13. Lisa Hatch (gr.6 LA) 14. Peter Hill (gr.8 Sci) 15. Rhonda Janelle (Phys Ed) 16. David LaBranche (gr.8 World Cultures) 17. Caitlin LeClair (Teaching Strategist) 18. Jennifer Lindsay (Sp. Ed) 19. Karen MacDonald (gr.6 LA) 20. Ruth MacLean (gr. 6 Sci) 21. Rachel Maloney-Hawkins (gr.7 Math) 22. David Mann (Comp. Sci) 23. Briana Markoff (ELL) 24. Mike McCarthy (Principal) 25. Kirsten McWilliams (Academic Writing) 26. Paul Michaud (gr. 7 SS) 27. Paula Murphy (gr.8 Math)

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none">28. Ella Norton (Art)29. Carol Nysten (gr.6 SS)30. Annemarie Orth (Span)31. Catherine Paul (gr.8 LA)32. Stephen Payne (gr.6 Sci)33. Marina Penalver (gr.8 Sci)34. Christian Perry (Health)35. Pamela Porensky (gr.6 Math)36. Jill Roland (gr.7 Sci)37. Melissa Ross (gr.7 LA)38. Bobby Shaddox (gr.6 SS)39. Deb Simmons (Reading)40. Wendy Steele (gr.7 LA)41. Dwight Thorne (gr.7 Math)42. David Trecartin (gr.6 Math)43. Jane Wellehan (Reading)44. Ann Young (gr.8 Math)45. Emily Zack (French) |
|--|---|

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

We conclude...

Student work was complex:

- Opportunities for exceeds and remediation are evident
- Tied to rigorous learning targets and specific rubrics
- Higher-order thinking evidenced through analysis/synthesis of topics and synthesis of primary and secondary sources; complex consideration of multiple perspectives
- Revision, elaboration and high language requisition demonstrated through peer editing and multiple drafts/review; rigorous evidence-based writing containing technical vocabulary
- Connected concepts to creative work; resulted in multi-format products with connection to big concepts and multiple perspectives
- Application of higher order literacy skills through expedition products like zines and 5-paragraph essays (almost every expedition)

Student work showed excellent craftsmanship:

- Rehearsals/revisions with specific feedback resulted in well-crafted products (student narrative that was accurate/correct and detail-oriented; oral presentations were polished; portraits and drawings produced from multiple drafts were beautiful and carefully executed)
- Products showed standard formats across disciplines, attention to detail in the writing process was evident, and rigorous drafts and feedback demonstrated perseverance.

Student work was authentic:

- Products were connected to the real world and various cultures (use of local experts, such as interviews with Portland civil rights activists, real stories of local immigrants, local science issues like energy, the environment, and local species)
- Products were connected to standards and included personal voice, original application of data, creativity and inventiveness, and graphic organizations
- Students acted as professionals and created work based on professional work products that had useful community function
- Clear audiences such as at local restaurants and City Hall

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

We conclude that the tasks and scoring tools that teachers are designing had the following strengths:

- Autobiographical perspective gave authenticity to the products, and authenticity was evidenced in the audiences.
- Revision was key to get to high craftsmanship in non-final products; craftsmanship stemmed from knowledge and time. Craftsmanship was found in the students’ original work, not in the printing/presentation
- Work was rigorously complex, showing high-level thinking and synthesis of targets. Process included strong student voice and student ownership of complex learning.
- Work included clear formats coupled with original/authentic elements

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

Goal	Action Steps/Dates
	artistic creativity/craftsmanship?

	<p>how are we having students archive their work? (in lots of plans now) number of “tools” : product descriptor; rubric; lists How can kids use well? What can we keep consistent from year to year? Common language of peer critique for exceptional students: how can we create products that allow them to get there themselves? Rubrics- examine as a team of teachers to make sure there is common language and the rubrics students are presented with provide a clear roadmap to quality.</p>
--	---

--	--

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

- 1. Four Freedoms- York 8**

- 2. Rules to Live By- Windsor 6 and York 6**

- 3. Academic Writing Project- Kirsten McWilliams**

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

- 1.**

- 2.**

- 3.**

