

Student Learning Objectives Template

Part 1: Standards and Assessments

Part 1 must be approved by school administration before part 2 is accessible on MyPGS. The majority of time on your SLO should be spent on reviewing data to determine student needs and in determining a quality assessment that is aligned to standards with clear, replicable scoring protocols.

Standards

Success Criteria

- Provides clear explanation why content is an appropriate focus and/or area of need
- Focuses on standards-based essential understandings/skills for the course and grade level
- Represents big ideas or essential understandings/skills students need to attain for success at the next level

*1.1: Content Area

1a: If “Other” was chosen, please specify here

English Language Arts

*1.2: Grade Level(s) and/or Course

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> PreK | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> K | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 | <input type="checkbox"/> 12 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 | <input type="checkbox"/> 13+ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10 | |

*1.3: Selected standards (copied and pasted from NVACs without abbreviating, a minimum of 2 and less than half for course are required)

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.1a: Introduce precise claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that establishes clear relationships among claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.
CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.1b: Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly, supplying evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience’s knowledge level and concerns.

*1.4: Why are these essential understandings/skills important to focus on, and what information on current student abilities and/or trend data informed the selection of these standards?

The standards all have to do with the different components of the argumentative essay and the core foundations of the writing process: establishing clear relationships among claim, counterclaim, reasons, and evidence. These standards are important to focus on due to the baseline data which revealed that most students scored below the expectations of the argumentative writing rubric. These standards are imperative because they define the expectations which must be met in the End of Course Exam in Writing. SBAC data from 8th grade shows that these students need to work on these skills in order to be successful on the EOC.

Assessments

Success Criteria

- The depth and complexity of the standards are present in the assessment
- Measurable and specific evidence will be used to determine progress toward the goals
- Assessment includes multiple opportunities or items to demonstrate growth toward learning targets

*1.5: Upload Assessment Documents:

- Baseline and Culminating Assessments
- Answer Keys/Scoring Rubrics
- Standards Alignment
- Translation to 8-level Scale

*1.6: How does your assessment address the depth and complexity of the selected standards?

This assessment has a variety of DOK levels ranging from levels one through three. Students begin by defining essay terminology; they identify and state relevant facts and quotes from the text . Next, they make observations and use context clues to infer the implications of the facts. Finally, students formulate a claim and develop a logical argument which cites evidence and draws conclusions.

*1.7: What measurable and specific evidence will you use to determine progress toward the goal? (formative process)

During the interval of instruction, I plan to formatively assess the students in multiple ways:

1. I assess the students' guided notes about the Dweck article to see if they were able to differentiate between fact and opinion.
2. I check the understanding of students when they underline parts/draw symbols next to their writing to see if they understand how to identify their own claim, counterclaim, fact, and support.
3. Students self-assess their annotations using a rubric to see if they are actively reading the text, which provides me with specific feedback about their annotation quantity as well as their overall interaction with the text: Evidence of thorough interaction; they ask and answer questions, summarize when necessary, mark inferences, identify and define unknown vocabulary, and they consistently write in the margin.
4. I formatively assess how productive small group discussions are when they are trying to examine facts from non-print text.
5. I formatively assess the students' graphic organizers to see if they have plenty of evidence and support and can write a claim.
6. Through *another* self-assessment, students use our rubric to examine their own writing of an investigative report to justify how well they executed the standards.
7. I again assess the depth of understanding when I read annotations from a short play.
8. I assess whether or not students can write text-based questions.
9. I assess students' understanding of the play by the statements and questions they contribute to the Socratic Seminar.
10. I also assess a student's ability to write a profound claim.

The annotations reveal the depth of knowledge students possess about the reading. Adjusting my line of questioning for a struggling student or an excelling student meets the needs of both. This kind of questioning can happen in one-on-one situations and during the Socratic seminar. It usually happens naturally in the latter. The self-evaluations students must write help them to advocate for their needs because they have to monitor the effectiveness of their choices during the process. They have to analyze their learning tasks and monitor how they activated their skills to complete the task. I take into consideration that I cannot take background knowledge for granted.

*1.8: Anticipated start date of instruction

09/30/2020

Enter in MyPGS and click “Submit for Review” when all required fields are completed.

Part 2: Student Population and Growth Targets

(Note: Part 2 cannot be started until Part 1 is complete and approved)

Instructional Interval

*2.1: Start of Instruction

9/30/2020

*2.2: End of Instruction

12/4/2020

*2.3: Is this Interval of Instruction a minimum of four weeks of school (not including holiday breaks and completed by the ~~deadline~~)

Yes

*2.4: On average, how many days per week do you instruct the selected students in the content area for this SLO?

2

*2.5: On average, how many minutes of instruction occur on a given day in the content area for this SLO?

45

Student Population

Success Criteria

- Student strengths, abilities and areas of need related to selected standards are described in a culturally responsive manner
- Analysis demonstrates the teacher believes all students can show growth
- Teacher utilizes evidence of student learning from baseline data and formative process to describe abilities relative to the selected standards
- Uses data to determine student abilities and needs (e.g. test scores/performance from prior years, etc.)

2.6: Now that you have looked at evidence of student performance on the baseline assessment and other data

The patterns I noticed after looking at the data versus the standards I assessed reveal the following:

1. Most students forgot to address the counterclaim within their argument.
2. Most students did not reference the author or cite specific facts from the text.
3. All students incorporated their opinions or support for the claim.
4. All students wrote a claim, yet most did not do so with precision, nor were the claims compelling or driving the argument forward. They assumed the audience understood the claim.

1 student Met the Standards:

25 students approached the standards, 14 of whom were 1 point away from meeting them:

11 students were at the LOW end of approaching the standards and will need more direction and support.

I will provide a graphic organizer to organize each of the standards since they did not refer to their rubric:

sources, describe the students' strengths, abilities and needs relative to the selected standards.

2.6a: Attachments for Student Population Data (Optional)

Student Growth Targets

Success Criteria

- Uses baseline or pretest data to determine appropriate growth/proficiency target with clear explanation of how targets are determined
- Targets are realistically achievable given the timeframe and identified 8-level scale
- Targets are rigorous yet attainable, developmentally appropriate, and measurable
- Multiple sources of data used to determine growth targets for all students are identified in the SLO (qualitative and quantitative)
- Includes explanations for growth/proficiency targets that establish and differentiate expected performance for identified students

*2.7: How did the data inform your choice in growth targets and target levels for students?

After the baseline, I taught a lesson on finding facts in a non-print text which forced students to pay careful attention to the evidence rather than just state opinions based on conjecture. Their mid-level assessments showed an overall raised consciousness about the standards in which they were responsible for meeting. I feel 21 of my students will at the very least raise their scores 2 points on the 8-point rubric. I am confident 3 of those students will raise their scores 3 points on the rubric because of the strides they made in the process and their ability to monitor their effectiveness through their self-assessments.

The midlevel data revealed only slight improvement, however, for 2 of my students. Moreover, their self-reflections did not show me they could explain their choices, so I chose to set their growth target up one point. Those 2 need consistent individual conferences. Other data: A recent vocabulary/word study test shows a serious struggle to understand and connect for these 2 students, even after a review AND a pretest. One scored a 6/30 and the other a 17/30.

One student was one of my lowest scorers on the baseline, yet in the mid-level she raised her score one step. Her self-evaluation stated she knows, "I need to work on the counterclaim because I forgot to put it in the report." The fact that she effectively monitored her effectiveness and choices assures me that she will meet her target.

Argumentative Essay Rubric Grades 9-10		PROMPT: AFTER READING CAROL DWECK'S, "WE CAN MAKE KIDS SMARTER..." Can we make kids smarter?				
		5 Points	4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Points
Claim CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.1a	The text introduces a compelling claim that is clearly arguable and takes a purposeful position in response to the prompt.	The text introduces a precise claim that is clearly arguable and takes an identifiable position in response to the prompt.	The text introduces a claim that is arguable and takes a position related to the prompt.	The text contains an unclear or emerging claim that suggests a vague position, attempting to relate to the prompt.	The text contains an unidentifiable claim or vague position veering from the prompt.	
Development (A) CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.1b	The text provides convincing and relevant data and credible evidence to support the claim and effectively points out the strengths of the claim using insightful commentary/opinion and logic.	The text provides sufficient and relevant data and credible evidence to support the claim and points out the strengths of the claim using appropriate commentary/opinion and logic.	The text provides sufficient data and evidence to back up the claim and points out the strengths of the claim using adequate commentary/opinion and logic.	The text provides data and evidence that attempts to support the claim and points out the strength of the claim using commentary/opinion and logic.	The text contains little data and unreliable evidence related to the claim and does not point out the strength of the claim using commentary/opinion and logic.	
Development (B) CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.1b	The text effectively addresses counterclaims.	The text addresses counterclaims fairly.	The text addresses counterclaims.	The text unclearly addresses counterclaims.	The text lacks counterclaims.	

EXCEEDS STANDARD: 12-15 POINTS
EMERGING THE STANDARD: 1-4 POINTS

MEETS STANDARD: 9-11 POINTS

APPROACHES STANDARD: 5-8 POINTS

Argumentative Essay Rubric Grades 9-10		PROMPT: WHO IS THE STRONGEST CHARACTER IN AUGUST STRINDBERG'S, <i>THE STRONGER</i>?				
		5 Points	4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Points
Claim CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.1a	The text introduces a compelling claim that is clearly arguable and takes a purposeful position in response to the prompt.	The text introduces a precise claim that is clearly arguable and takes an identifiable position in response to the prompt.	The text introduces a claim that is arguable and takes a position related to the prompt.	The text contains an unclear or emerging claim that suggests a vague position, attempting to relate to the prompt.	The text contains an unidentifiable claim or vague position veering from the prompt.	
Development (A) CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.1b	The text provides convincing and relevant data and credible evidence to support the claim and effectively points out the strengths of the claim using insightful commentary/opinion and logic.	The text provides sufficient and relevant data and credible evidence to support the claim and points out the strengths of the claim using appropriate commentary/opinion and logic.	The text provides sufficient data and evidence to back up the claim and points out the strengths of the claim using adequate commentary/opinion and logic.	The text provides data and evidence that attempts to support the claim and points out the strength of the claim using commentary/opinion and logic.	The text contains little data and unreliable evidence related to the claim and does not point out the strength of the claim using commentary/opinion and logic.	
Development (B) CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.1b	The text effectively addresses counterclaims.	The text addresses counterclaims fairly.	The text addresses counterclaims.	The text unclearly addresses counterclaims.	The text lacks counterclaims.	

EXCEEDS STANDARD: 12-15 POINTS
EMERGING THE STANDARD: 1-4 POINTS

MEETS STANDARD: 9-11 POINTS

APPROACHES STANDARD: 5-8 POINTS

C

<u>WCSD 8-LEVEL STANDARDS-BASED REPORTING</u>	WCSD 8 LEVELS	ENGLISH 3-4 H GRADING RUBRIC FOR ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAY
EXCEEDING STANDARDS	HIGH (8)	14-15 POINTS
	LOW (7)	12-13 POINTS
MEETING STANDARDS	HIGH (6)	10-11 POINTS
	LOW (5)	9 POINTS
APPROACHING STANDARDS	HIGH (4)	7-8 POINTS
	LOW (3)	5-6 POINTS
EMERGING THE STANDARDS	HIGH (2)	3-4 POINTS
	LOW (1)	1-2 POINTS

Student Name	Baseline Level	Baseline Max	Culminating Target	Culminating Max
A	5	8	7	8
B	4	8	6	8
C	3	8	5	8
D	3	8	5	8
E	3	8	5	8
F	4	8	6	8
G	4	8	6	8
H	4	8	6	8
I	4	8	6	8
J	4	8	5	8
K	4	8	6	8
L	4	8	7	8
M	4	8	6	8
N	3	8	5	8
O	3	8	5	8
P	4	8	5	8
Q	3	8	5	8
R	3	8	6	8
S	3	8	6	8
T	4	8	6	8
U	4	8	6	8
V	3	8	5	8
W	4	8	6	8
X	4	8	6	8
Y	3	8	5	8