Protocol for Collaborative Scoring

NORMS:

- Put students at the center of the work
- **Recognize the impact of our words, and work to understand others**
- Be present, prepared, and engaged, and use technology in appropriate ways
- Step up to speak ideas, and step back to share the air. Be brief and focused.
- Honor start and end times, honor the agenda, and begin and end in a mindful way by grounding, checking in, setting priorities and debriefing.
- Offer and carefully consider detailed and big-picture feedback in order to improve the work

INDIVIDUAL Scoring:

1. Participants read through the pieces of student work quietly and mark their assessments of each piece on a rubric. Each performance indicator should be scored separately (if multiple indicators are being assessed.)

GROUP Calibration:

Participants work in small groups to discuss the pieces of work and to arrive at consensus about the level of proficiency of each one.

Participants share scores for one piece at a time, Round Robin:

- Each participant shares their scores for each Performance Indicator for a piece of work. The group works through the Performance Indicators one by one, discussing them until they arrive at a consensus score. The consensus score **for each indicator** is noted by the facilitator.

- If it is impossible to arrive at consensus after about 10 minutes of discussion, put the piece aside in a separate pile and move on to the next piece. Indicate on the scoring sheet that no consensus was reached.

- As you discuss each piece, follow these guidelines:
    - Be open and listen to others
    - Refer to specific features of the student work as you explain your viewpoint. Ask yourself:
        - What qualities are we looking for? Does this reflect the thinking we want to see?

    - Be sure to refer to the language of the scoring criteria in this discussion.

Debrief Reflections:

- What are our students doing well; what are our concerns?
- Does this work seem similar to work you have seen from students in other years?
- Are we all asking for similar demonstrations of this skill in our classes? Are there any pieces that don't really enable us to make a judgment on the student's level of proficiency? If so, can we imagine how the assessment might change or evolve?