1. Analyzing Learning

a. Identify the standards/learning targets measured by the assessment you chose for analysis.

[The chosen assessment is the pre-assessment I administered at the beginning of the lesson sequence. This preassessment is designed to evaluate students’ general and background knowledge related to the theme embedded in the Central Focus: analyze in detail the theme of gender roles and expectations. This theme aligns with one of the English Language-Arts Common Core standards: CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RL.9-10.2: Determine a theme or central idea of a text and analyze in detail its development over the course of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details. The students have had one lecture related to the Central Focus, which explored the 19th century Women’s Movement and its implications today. The next four lessons will be devoted to reading, discussing, and analyzing the 1896 play Doll House through a gendered lens. Consequently, the preassessment includes a variety of questions that will assess students’ base knowledge of gender roles, rights, expectations and stereotypes, as gathered from the lecture and their prior knowledge on this topic. The assessment has three components: a quantitative section, a qualitative section, and a student voice section. In the quantitative section students read a list of statements and are asked to identify the correct ones by circling the item letter. There are a total of 7 correct statements out of 15 possible choices. In the qualitative section, students are asked to generate two lists of gender-based roles/expectations/stereotypes that existed in the 19th century and still exist today: one list for women and one for men. The third student voice component contains two sub-questions. One asks students to self-evaluate their confidence level on the Central Focus topic. The second asks students to choose from a list of given resources which ones they think they will use to support their learning on the topic. All these items and directions can be seen in the blank Assessment included at the end of this commentary.

b. Provide the evaluation criteria used to analyze learning.

[For this preassessment, I created an answer key to evaluate student responses. The first section entails right/wrong answers for quantitative judgment. On my answer key, I circled all the correct statements to guide my scoring of students’ work. For the second qualitative response section, I generated lists to compare with student responses. I knew that some students would propose ideas not on my prepared lists, and I was flexible to accept such thoughts, if appropriate. For the third section of student voice questions, answers were going to vary, so I indicated that on my answer key. Students would be circling one number between 1-5 for their Central Focus confidence level, and they would be circling 3 of the given 5 resources for consultation during the unit. I did not give/write a final score on these preassessments because they serve as a mark of]
prior learning and base knowledge. The postassessment, which will entail similar content and student voice questions will be scored, as that is reflective of summative learning and aligns with specific learning targets for this unit.]

c. Provide a graphic (table or chart) or narrative that summarizes student learning for your whole class.
   Be sure to summarize student learning for all evaluation criteria described above.

[The bar graph to the left displays results from the whole class on the quantitative question in the pre- assessment, which asked students to circle the items that correctly reflected various gender rights/restrictions in the 19th century. There were 15 items to choose from, and 7 of them were correct. As indicated in the graph, there was a range of performance on this question. Everyone selected at least 3 correct choices. The mean was 5 and 6 correct choices, with 5 students selecting each. 2 students selected all 7 items correctly and therefore scored perfectly on that question. My focus students are representative of this spread of scores. Student 1 performed perfectly, choosing all 7 correct answers. See Student 1 Work Sample for reference. Student 2 chose only 3 correct answers, and in fact left a whole section blank because he “forgot” to complete it (as he indicated in his response to my feedback, seen on Student 2 Work Sample). Student 3 chose 6 correct answers, as shown on Student 3 Work Sample.

The pie charts below reflect a class summary of the two-part qualitative question on the preassessment. This question asked students to generate two lists of 5 gender-based roles/expectations/stereotypes, one list for women and another for men. As the charts show, 88% of the class was able to complete the task for female lists, and 44% was able to complete the task for the male lists. Everyone was able to generate at least 2 items for each list, but students were better able to generate lists for women as opposed to men. At least 3 items were generated on each student’s female list, while some students could think of only 2 items for the male list. This difference makes sense, since students just had a lecture focusing on the 19th century Women’s Movement, including the various rights, restrictions, roles, and stereotypes which they were trying to reform. Therefore the focus was on the female perspective, and less the male. However, based on the evidence from the preassessment, some students were clearly able to pick up on male gender norms implicitly from the lecture. Again, my focus students are representative of the spectrum of performance on question #2. Student 1 produced five items for both lists; student 2 wrote four items for the women’s list, and only two for the men’s. Student 3 was able to generate six items for the female list, and three for the men’s. See all three Student Work Samples for reference.]

d. Provide a graphic (table or chart) or narrative that summarizes student understanding of their own learning progress (student voice).
The preassessment includes two questions integrating student voice. The first is a measure at the lesson sequence start of student confidence on the Central Focus theme, the topic of gender roles, expectations, rights, and stereotypes. Students were asked to rate their comfort level with the topic on a scale of 1-5, 1=low/"I guessed on everything" and 5=high/"I feel like an expert".

As the bar graph to the right depicts, all students felt somewhat confident in this topic, reporting a confidence level of 3 or higher. The majority of students (14 total) self-assessed at levels 3 and 4. Two students self-assessed their confidence at the expert level. My focus students reflect the two extremes of this student voice piece: Student 1 reported a confidence level of 5, and both Student 2 and Student 3 reported a confidence level of 3, as reflected on the Student Work submissions.

The second student voice question is geared towards resource use. From a list of 5 potential resources, students were asked to identify 3 that they planned to consult during the unit to improve their understanding on the Central Focus topic. The pie chart to the right reveals the distribution of resources that students predicted using. The most popular choices include *Doll House* reading, Conference time, and Lecture notes, which received interest from 13 students, 13 students and 14 students, respectively. 8 students identified Internet research as a potential resource. No one suspected that emailing the teacher would be an approach they would take to help improve learning this unit.

e. Use evidence found in the **3 student work samples and student self-reflections**, and the **whole class summary** to analyze the patterns of learning for the whole class and differences for groups or individual learners relative to comprehending and making meaning from complex text, interpreting and/or responding to complex text

[To gauge student learning from the preassessment, I took two approaches. The first was to provide feedback on the preassessment and request student response to that feedback. The second was to administer a postassessment to examine student learning in relationship to the preassessment, which would demonstrate understanding gained from the entire lesson sequence. (For reference, blank versions of both the preassessment and postassessment can be found at the end of this commentary.)

In the first approach, I provided feedback on the preassessments, and for homework the night of Lesson 3 I asked students to respond to my feedback. In this way, I could assess student learning over halfway through our lesson sequence. To my satisfaction, all students were able to supplement any deficiencies shown in the preassessment with correct and thoughtful responses. The first item, choosing correct gender rights and restrictions, did not pose much opportunity for student revision. However, one student wrote an explanation for an item that was not part of the original 7 correct statements, and convinced me that her decision was supported by thoughtful and accurate information. For the second section, the lists of gender norms, all students were able to complete their lists of 5 items, and some even added extra contributions. In fact, all of my focus students overachieved in this section. Student 1, with the requested 5 pertinent answers, added one more item for each of her lists. Student 2, who was originally short 1 female norm and 3 male norms, added one more for his female list and 4 more for his male. Student 3, with a preliminarily complete women’s list but sparse 3-item list for the men, added 2 additional female norms and 3 more male norms. In response to the student voice questions, I chose to pick one of the identified resources from each student and ask how
they would use, or already have used, that resource. This inquiry would show me how effective that particular resource was at supporting learning for that student. Resource selections can be seen on Student Work samples, and more details on their feedback results are discussed below, in answer to #2c.

In my second approach to analyze student learning, I compared student’s preassessment performance with their postassessment performance. Basically, the preassessment reflects learning from the one lecture on the 19th century Women’s Movement, as well as prior knowledge on the Central Focus theme of gender rights, restrictions, expectations and stereotypes. On the other hand, the postassessment reflects targeted learning in relationship to the standards and specific learning objectives of the unit, based on work done with Ibsen’s play, Doll House. For example, the first 2 items on the preassessment asks students to demonstrate knowledge on general 19th century gender trends. The postassessment however, requires students to apply their understanding of 19th century gender norms to specific characters in Doll House. The directions on the postassessment state “Pick 3 of the characters from Doll House and explain how they embodied or defied typical 19th century gender roles and expectations. Address their motivation, and whether or not they change over the course of the play.” In answering this question, students will demonstrate their analytical learning on several levels. First, they will show they have learned specific 19th century gender norms by applying them to 3 different characters of the play. This task relates to one of the learning targets in Lesson 1, to explore the development of themes. Next, by describing each character’s motivations and whether or not they change over the course of the play, students will demonstrate understanding of learning targets from Lessons 2 and 3, discussing multiple and conflicting motivations and the development of complex, dynamic characters. In other words, this qualitative question demands students to demonstrate understanding of several learning targets addressed in the learning sequence in a comprehensive, thoughtful way.

In examining student responses to this postassessment qualitative question, I conclude that students performed very well and displayed an impressive amount of learning. The majority of students chose to analyze two female and one male character, many focusing on the main characters of Nora, her husband Torvald, and their friend Kristine. Most students address how each character embodies or defies the gender norms of the time, but many students forgot one of the other tasks: to describe the character’s motivation and dynamic or static presence in the play. My three focus students are representative of these whole class trends. Student 1 does a brilliant job of integrating gender norms, motivations and dynamic or static quality. Student 2 also analyzes each character’s gendered attributes well, but misses one of the other two requirements. His description of two characters lacks mention of their motivations, and he fails to address how one character changes over the course of the play. Student 3 follows a similar trend: she thoroughly describes each character’s gendered qualities, but fails to analyze character motivation and static or dynamic development over the course of the play. Student 1 is one of my “gifted” students, and reflects the performance of my other highly advanced students, who were able to fulfill all 3 elements of the analytical task in a concise, insightful paragraph. Student 2 actually reflects a level of understanding above his normal performance, which is great evidence for teaching strategies during this lesson sequence that allow him to succeed. This student is one of my struggling writers, so for him to summarize 2 out of 3 required analytical details in a concise paragraph is a great accomplishment! Student 3 is representative of my lower-performing students, demonstrating sufficient learning in one area but lacking comprehensive analytical ability. Student 3 is my ELL student and her performance reflects the difficulty of an English language learner to communicate complex and thorough analysis. To sum up whole-class learning, students demonstrated exceptional learning of the first learning target, and varied results on achieving the objectives from Lesson 2 and 3.
In terms of the student voice question related to confidence on the Central Focus theme, results are promising. (Please note: one student was absent when the postassessment was administered, so the total number of students tested was 15, not 16.) All students except one reported a confidence level of 4 or 5. The one student who reported a confidence level of 3 was actually my focus Student 2. From his performance on the qualitative questions of character analysis however, as described above, I would say that he demonstrated great learning. I was indeed impressed with his analytical summary of *Doll House* characters and suspect that his self-reflection is an indication of a larger issue of shaky confidence in the field of English Language-Arts. He is one of my struggling writers, but showed marked improvement in his written work over the course of this unit. Student 1, one of my advanced students, showed expected confidence, self-reporting 5’s on both the pre- and postassessment. Student 3 displayed a gain in confidence, starting with a 3 on the preassessment and indicated a 4 on the postassessment.

With respect to resources consulted during the unit, the postassessment reveals that *Doll House* readings and Conference time lived up to the student’s high expectations, while group discussions, writing exercises, and family discussions were also found to be extremely helpful to support learning. The postassessment includes more resource options than the preassessment to reflect a greater multitude of resources actually used during the unit. The original five resources from the preassessment are listed (Conference time, email teacher, internet research, lecture notes and *Doll House* reading) but include additional resources that either were integrated into the lessons, or that I learned were used outside of class. The fact that *Doll House* readings earned the most recognition indicates it was an effective tool for understanding the Central Focus for this unit. In fact, all three of my focus students selected the text as one of their three most helpful resources used during the unit. There was varied response among my focus students as to the other two most helpful resources, which reflects similar trends in the whole class. Student 1 indicated family discussions and internet research (on the wage gap, women in politics, and the current state of women’s education across the globe). Evidence of this pursuit of extra knowledge can be seen in the Student 1 Work sample, and reflects this student’s advanced learning abilities. I am glad she accepted the extra challenge to supplement required learning during this unit with increased knowledge on current gender struggles. Student 2 found class discussions and Conference time the most helpful in addition to the text. This makes sense according to how he learns, gaining much knowledge from conversation and peer interaction, as opposed to individual work and writing exercises (although his writing did improve, as I alluded to earlier). Alternatively, Student 3 reported writing exercises and lecture/class notes as the most helpful resource supplements to the text. As my ELL
student, she reveals the importance of reinforcing knowledge through repetition of ideas and concepts individually. Through written work and review of class and lecture notes, she was able to get a solid grasp on key gender concepts and how they are applied to a complex literary text. See the postassessment pie chart above for a visual summary of resources used by the whole class.]

2. Feedback to Guide Further Learning

Refer to specific evidence of submitted feedback to support your explanations.

a. In what form did you submit your evidence of feedback for the 3 focus students?

[Written directly on work samples or in a separate document]

b. Describe what you did to help each student understand his/her performance on the assessment.

[In order to indicate performance on the preassessment, I used a combination of symbols and written feedback. For the first, qualitative section, I drew a little check mark next to correctly chosen items, and circled items that had not been correctly identified as true statements. For students that didn’t fill out the last multi-item question, I asked them why. The Student 2 Work Sample demonstrates this inquiry – I was curious whether students had misunderstood the directions or if they simply forgot; Student 2 reports that he simply forgot. For single missed items, I wrote succinct explanations to increase student learning on those particular facts. Beside this quantitative section, I also wrote a small narrative blurb summarizing how well students demonstrated their factual learning from the opening lecture on the 19th century Women’s Movement. A sample of my narrative blurbs is evident in Student 2 and 3 Work Samples. For the middle, qualitative section of gender lists, I either indicated strong performance of knowledge with an accolade or asked students if they could complete their lists “now” – which at the time was over halfway through the unit and two-thirds of the way finished with Doll House reading and discussions. I phrased this with questions like “Can you list two more now?” or “What other ideas could you add to this now?” as seen in Student 2 and 3 Work Samples. For the final student voice section, I picked one of chosen resources and asked a specific question pertaining to that student’s use of it. I intended to discover how each student used one particular resource. This information would guide my instructional decisions towards the end of the learning segment, for example what to focus on during Doll House discussions and how to structure Conference time.]

c. Explain how feedback provided to the 3 focus students addresses their individual strengths and needs relative to the standards/learning targets measured.

[For the first section, my focus students demonstrated varied performance in relation to the Central Focus theme of 19th century gender norms, so my feedback was specific to each. Student 1, one of my high achievers, identified 7/7 correct choices and received a confirming “Excellent!” response from me. Student 2 circled one incorrect statement, so I briefly explained why that statement was not to be circled. He also did not address any of the employment positions, so I asked him why that section was left untouched. I specifically wanted to know if the problem was one of negligence or misunderstanding. Student 3 chose all but 1 correct statement, and for her I also wrote a quick note about why that job was a filled by women. In the Student 2 and 3 Work Samples, I show how my feedback can be used as a learning tool – instead of merely identifying right or wrong, I describe why a statement is correct. For other students, I prompted them to review their lecture notes for the correct answer.

For the second section, I subtly indicated insufficient performance by asking students if they could complete their lists. On both Student 2 and 3 Work Samples I wrote such a prompt for the male gender norm lists. I also had clarifying questions for each of these students. For Student 2, I asked if he could explain what he meant about women unable to “dress however they want.” For Student 3, I was curious if she had considered whether the top three items on her female list applied to 19th century stereotypes, or were merely current gender attributes. As evidenced in the student responses to my feedback, both were able to thoughtfully
answer my inquiries. Alternatively, the Student 3 Work Sample demonstrates how I am able to challenge high-performing students with my feedback. Student 3 generated a complete list of insightful examples, but I challenged her to demonstrate new learning by asking her “Would you add anything to them now since reading Doll House?” She accepted the challenge with interesting additions, two for the female list and one for the male.

d. How will you support students to apply the feedback to guide improvement, either within the learning segment or at a later time?

[My main method of supporting students to guide improvement was to supply my feedback in the form of questions that demanded student response. I returned the preassessments to students during Lesson 3, and required students to respond to my feedback as homework that night. In this way, I was facilitating growth within the learning segment. This strategy was also attentive to different learning abilities – students could address my questions at their own pace, not limited to a particular amount of class time which may have been insufficient for my slower processing students. All of my focus students represent the trend of the whole class in demonstrating improvement on the gender lists within the learning segment. As examples, Student 2 added one item to his female list and four to his male list. Student 3 wrote two additional items to her female list, and three additional items to her male list. There was also a significant amount of learning shown in how students used one particular resource in their response to my feedback on question #3b. Student 1 demonstrated pursuit of individual internet research on the current wage gap, women in politics, and the state of women’s education across the globe. I would like to take advantage of this additional learning from Student 1 by asking her to share her findings with the class. We could then engage in a discussion to compare current trends with those expressed in Doll House and other 19th century examples. In response to my feedback, Student 3 explained how the Doll House text reinforced her understanding of 19th century gender roles. She wrote, “There was an unexpected change in Nora’s character that showed me that women weren’t always fragile and tributary [subordinate]. I learned a lot about the rules of that time.” This statement embodies deep understanding of the play and our learning targets – excellent accomplishment for an ELL! An interesting follow-up for this student, my ELL German exchange student, would be to ask her to share how these 19th century American stereotypes compare with 19th century German gender norms.

Finally, in response to my feedback a few students posed challenges for me to address. For example, as seen in the Student 2 Work Sample, Student 2 stated, “We talked about roles/expectations for women in the 19th century, but what about for men?” While I don’t totally agree with this question’s implications, it does give me pause. The 19th century Women’s Movement lecture focused on the predicament of women, but it also addressed tangentially the roles and expectations of men. For example, items (c) and (e) in the preassessment question 1 address 19th century male rights: the Contagious Diseases Act of 1864 protected men from contracting threatening sexually transmitted infections from women, and not vice versa; under the Matrimonial Clause Act of 1857, only husbands were allowed to initiate divorce from their wives, and not the other way around. Additionally, throughout our discussions and analysis of Doll House characters, we focused on both the female and male characters. Despite these arguments, the question from Student 2 urges me make a pointed effort to frame a segment of a future lesson from the male perspective. Advanced students will likely gather evidence from both perspectives even if only one is emphasized, but more concrete thinkers and slower processors benefit from directed guidance from their instructor to analyze an issue through a particular lens.]

3. Evidence of Language Understanding and Use

Explain and provide evidence for the extent to which your students were able to use or struggled to use language (selected function, vocabulary, and additional identified language demands from Task 1) to develop content understandings.
The main language demand in the Central Focus for this unit is analyze. Other demands necessary to master on the way to full analysis include identify, compare and contrast, discuss, examine and summarize. The preassessment starts with one of these basic sub-functions, compare and contrast, put into list form. It would not make sense to ask the students to analyze gender roles, expectations and stereotypes before this unit begins, because they do not yet have the tools to supply answers to that complex task. However, they can use prior knowledge to demonstrate a beginning level of analysis, that of comparing and contrasting. Therefore, I ask students to make two lists, one for female and one for male stereotypes. In so doing, they are essentially comparing the two different spheres of gender norms. It’s interesting to look at the lists horizontally to see whether the student responses match up item by item on their lists. For example, in the Student 1 Work Sample, the first two items on the female list are “be a mother/caretaker” and “get married and have children.” On the male list, Student 1 wrote “be the dominant partner in a relationship” and “make sure wife behaves.” While these four ideas do not perfectly correlate one to one, both items describe relationship/family roles and I consider them positive examples of the student demonstrating adept ability at the compare/contrast language function. In fact, Student 1’s third examples on both lists are neatly tied to one another. The female list shows “emotional and ‘whiny’” while the male counterpart reads “inappropriate to show emotion.” The quality of this student’s responses in addition to the quantity she is able to produce on this preassessment ensure me that she will begin this unit with excellent momentum. Student 2 started strong with his first correlated example, but then lost content for the male side. In the Student 2 Work Sample, we can see his first female item is “stay at home, take care of children” while his male item reads “work for the family.” Here we see the duties of a relationship divided by the gender, a promising direct correlation. The second items read “had to have a man with them if they went out” and “aren’t good with children.” These two items clearly do not speak to the same category, and here is where the student diverges from displaying adequate compare/contrast ability. In his defense, when the students respond to my feedback on the preassessment, the student admits his knowledge gap and asks “We talked about roles/expectations for women in the 19th century, but what about for men?” Once I received his feedback, I knew I must highlight more male gender expectations to fill this gap. Student 3 shows a similar gap of knowledge to Student 2. Her first gender items are also correlated, her female list starts with “bossy” and her male list with “boss.” This clever word play is actually a direct quote from a digital resource the students were asked to consult the night before, so it’s a testament to this student’s preparation, even if her prior background cannot make up for further knowledge gaps.

In terms of vocabulary, the preassessments demonstrate both basic vocabulary use and more sophisticated learned words. Some key terms and concepts that came up throughout our unit that were critical to analyzing gender norms and stereotypes include responsibility, duty, appearance, emotion, education, relationship, innocence, selfishness, control, possession, ownership, marriage, naïve, dominant, subordinate, inferior. When the students first took the preassessment, we had not yet worked with these terms. Student 2 and 3 show their limited vocabulary at the unit start, using every day language to fill out the gender norm lists. (Please refer to their Work Samples for this simple vocabulary.) This lower level of performance is to be expected from both of them, Student 2 a struggling writer and Student 3 my ELL. On the other hand, Student 1 displays a sophisticated use of language already, representing her advanced language abilities. She uses words like refined, dominant, inappropriate, and breadwinner. However, all students demonstrate more sophisticated language later in the unit, when they respond to my feedback on the preassessment. For example, Student 1 moves from sophisticated single words to conceptual phrases like “understanding of how the world works” and “exercising complete control”. Student 2 shows growth with new words like high position, possession and expected. Student 3 demonstrates language learning through ideas like “domestic violence,” “duty to behave,” “ruler of the family,” “unexpected change” and “fragile.” The way these students demonstrated new, sophisticated language through their feedback responses give unmistakable evidence for increase knowledge in language demand and function, while simultaneously showing understanding of content knowledge.]
4. Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

a. Based on your analysis of student learning presented in prompts 1c–e, describe next steps for instruction to impact student learning for the whole class and for the three focus students and other individuals/groups with specific needs.

[The information gathered from assessing student learning will impact my future teaching in multiple ways. In general, I am happy with the base knowledge and prior learning exhibited on the preassessment, and how students exhibited learning during the unit in response to my feedback prompts. I am also happy with student performance on the postassessment, but will make a few adjustments to future postassessments and follow-up on certain aspects of student learning.

For the preassessment, the fact that several students did not address the multi-faceted item (h) in question 1 alerts me that I should have either rephrased the question, or called student attention to it during the test. I believe that I did describe that item once all students had the assessment in hand, but I imagine many were not listening too carefully because they were scanning the whole test for content and expectations. In the future, if there is a unique item on a test, I will alert students at multiple junctures to that item so they have a better chance of fulfilling requirements. In addition, in my directions for question 2, I ask students to write five bullet points, but I don’t explain that I expect them to be phrases or extended thoughts. As a result, several students wrote one-word answers. As seen in the Student 3 Work Sample, students that have trouble producing sufficient written language opted for one-word responses. My initial justification of asking for bullet points to avoid having grammar or complete sentences interfere with idea generation. But after analyzing student responses, I realize I must be clearer at outlining my expectations of language production so that students will at least express thoughts appropriate to a 10th-grade writing level. Notably, Student 3 demonstrates that she is capable of producing keen insight when she responds to my feedback prompts. As for my gifted and talented students, I noticed a trend in their personal motivation to research particular aspects of our Central Focus. In the future, I want to take advantage of this extended learning and offer them a chance to share their findings with the class. As seen in her work sample, Student 1 demonstrates how she researched current gender trends, including the wage gap, women in politics, and female education. Another talented student shared that she researched symbolism in Dolls House and found her results to assist her analysis and discussion during class. Capitalizing on the supplemental knowledge and motivation of my advanced students will reinforce their extra efforts and give other students a chance to broaden their learning.

Postassessment analysis also gives me some relevant instructional guidance. I am happy with the formulation of my first qualitative question that asks students to summarize their analysis in terms of 3 or the 4 learning targets from the lesson sequence. Performance on this item reflected a spectrum of ability, but generally a higher level of analysis and sophisticated written discourse than normal. For example, Student 2, one of my struggling writers, demonstrated a higher level of summary analysis on the postassessment than he has all term. Student 3, my ELL student failed to demonstrate two of the desired learning targets. To be honest, I believe that the answers of my lower-performing students did not necessarily reflect their total learning. Based on their answers, I think they did not fully comprehend what was being asked: they fulfilled their first requirement, to explain how characters embodied or defied typical 19th century gender roles and expectations, but most did not address the second requirement, to address character’s motivation, and whether or not they changed over the course of the play. To ensure that my lower-performing students had an equal chance to deliver on these prompts, I should have highlighted this two-step question, and perhaps repeated it when students were midway through the assessment. I think advanced students have several assets that they take to tests that differ from struggling students: (1) they read through directions more carefully and thoroughly to know what is expected of them (2) they review their answers to make sure they have met all expectations (3) they perform deeper analysis during learning and (4) they retain more information. While I can employ various instructional strategies throughout a learning sequence to strengthen student’s abilities of (3) and (4)
above, during an assessment itself, I can do a better job of addressing (1) and (2) to level the playing field. A final adjustment I will make on future postassessments is to add a bonus question geared for advanced students. The bonus question would not be included in the total score of the assessment, but an extra item to promote deep thinking for those that finish the assessment early or seek an extra challenge. Such bonus questions, if answered adequately, could serve as fodder for future class discussions or come into consideration with a borderline grade.

b. Explain how these next steps follow from your analysis of student learning and their self-reflections. Support your explanation with principles from research and/or theory.

[The future instructional steps I elaborated above are important methods to improve my teaching because they are supported by current research and theory. Providing clear directions for student tasks is a critical strategy for ensuring high student performance that both Smagorinsky (2008) and Taylor and Nolan (2008) underline. Smagorinsky emphasizes the necessity of outlining exact directions and expectations for writing assignments so that students have no confusion about their deliverables. His expertise is in conceptual unit design and written assignments, but his theories are highly relevant to smaller writing tasks, such as the gender lists on my preassessment and the short answer section on my postassessment. Taylor and Nolan have a 9-rule formula for writing short answer questions, and Rule #2 states that teachers should make certain the prompt is simple and clearly indicates what the teacher wants to know. I think that my postassessment prompt could have been worded in a more structured way to clarify my expectations. For instance I could have indicated the 3 sought-after pieces of information as a list so that students would clearly, visually see the knowledge I wanted them to demonstrate. This advice would change the original prompt from “Pick 3 of the characters from Doll House and explain how they embodied or defied typical 19th century gender roles & expectations. Address their motivation, and whether or not they change over the course of the play” to “Pick 3 of the characters from Doll House and analyze them in terms of the following 3 aspects:

1. How they embodied or defied typical 19th century gender roles & expectations
2. Their motivation(s)
3. Whether or not they change over the course of the play (are they static or dynamic characters?)

Including a bonus question on assessments would allow advanced students more challenge, or average to low-performing students a chance to demonstrate insightful understanding. While some theorists disapprove of extra credit (Taylor and Nolan, 2008), bonus questions serve as extra challenges without the controversial status of making up for previous lack of effort or poor performance. A bonus question is not an extra assignment offered to students to make up for negligence or poor performance at an earlier time. Instead, it is an opportunity for students that finish all required items to demonstrate higher-order reflection. Depending on individual student performance on the assessment at hand, it is available to all, unlike extra credit, which is usually only made available to students asking for it or needing it.

The two student voice items from both assessments are elements that I would like to continue to employ in future assessments. I think these were extremely helpful markers of self-reflection and critical resources. The confidence rating was not only an indication of self-assessed learning, but also of general academic confidence. For students in whom I saw a significant increase in knowledge but did not reflect that in their personal rating, I want to make sure I communicate to them how visible their improvement was to me. For these students, I must be sure to employ more positive encouragement and celebration of their achievements – Student 2, for example. For students whose rating aligned with my own impression, I can be more certain that their level of self-efficacy and academic confidence needs less monitoring and reinforcement. I can concentrate on giving these students more constructive criticism and challenge items. Student 1 falls into this category.
The resource questions help me know which elements students find most helpful to their learning. Trends include small group Conference time, reading discussions and textual examination. In Conferences, I can be sure to address any questions or misconceptions not covered in class, and continue to use the small group atmosphere to ask students to share personal, cultural and community connections with the material. According to Fay and Funk (1995) continuing to integrate personal and cultural stories with academic learning builds student worth and motivation for increased performance results. I would like to increase prompts to discuss certain questions with family members or peers outside of class to capitalize on my students' highly social lives and unique family backgrounds. Finally, I will continue to use textual analysis as a building block for peer and group discussions of complex text. Reading discussions focused on a single element, such as character relationships, theme development, or conflict and tension help students focus on an isolated perspective. After analyzing through specific lenses, tasks where students are asked to integrate these singular perspectives will allow them to put their learning into comprehensive picture. This sort of culminating experience is what Smagorinsky (2008) touts as the best approach to put student learning into a complete package. It embeds understanding of an overarching concept into memory that won’t suffer even if particular individual pieces are forgotten.
Assessment 1.1

Doll’s House – Lesson Segment Formal Pre-Assessment

1) What were some rights and/or restrictions placed on women in the 19th and early 20th century? Circle all that apply:

- Women were allowed to own their own property.
- When women married, their husbands assumed all their personal wealth.
- With the Contagious Diseases Act in 1864, women were ensured health care if they contracted an infection from a male (whether from their husband or from prostitution).
- It was inappropriate for women to go out in public if they weren’t accompanied by either their father, husband, or some other male relative.
- Under the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857, men AND women were able to initiate divorce from their partner.
- When women had children, they had great access to healthcare, and got paid time off to care for their newborns.
- Women wore only a limited array of clothing, including long petticoats, full-arm length dresses and jackets, high-neck shirts.
- Women could choose from a number of employment opportunities, including:
  - law
  - government
  - military service
  - cook
  - politics
  - agricultural labor
  - maid service
  - unskilled factory work

2) What are some gender-based stereotypes – roles and expectations of both men and women - that were prevalent in the 19th and early 20th century that still apply today? Write 5 bullet points for each gender. Below is a list of topics to help generate ideas.

- employment
- household duties
- personality traits
- appearance
- emotionality/sensitivity
- relationships
- family role
- education
- arts

Roles/Expectations/Stereotypes of Women

Roles/Expectations/Stereotypes of Men

3a) On a scale of 1-5 (1= I guessed on everything, 5=I feel like an expert on this topic) how confident do you feel about your answers on this assessment? Circle one number: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

3b) In order to feel more confident on this topic, or to keep learning more, which resources from the list below will you pursue in the next week? Circle your top 3 resource choices.
Assessment 4
Lesson 4: *Doll House* – Lesson Segment **Formal Post-Assessment**

**Short Answer questions:**

1. Pick 3 of the characters from *Doll House* and explain how they embodied or defied typical 19th century gender roles & expectations. Address their motivation, and whether or not they change over the course of the play. Write 3-4 complete sentences for each of your 3 characters.

   - Nora
   - Torvald
   - Kristine
   - Rank
   - Anne-Marie/ Helene
   - Krogstad

   A.

   B.

   C.

2. On a scale of 1-5, how confident do you feel now about your knowledge of gender roles, expectations and stereotypes in the 19th and early 20th century? (Circle a #)

   1 2 3 4 5

   1= I know the same as I did before this unit
   3= I learned some but I still feel shaky on some aspects of the topic
   5= I feel so well informed that I could comfortably lead a group discussion on this topic

3. In order to learn more and feel more confident on this topic, which resources did you make use of this last week? Circle all that apply.

   Conference time  email teacher  internet research  lecture notes
   Doll House reading  group discussions  peer discussions outside of class
   Class notes  discussions with family  writing exercises  other: ____________

4. Of the above resources, which 3 resources did you find most helpful?

   1.
   2.
   3.