1. Analyzing Student Learning

   a. Identify the specific standards/learning targets measured by the assessment chosen for analysis.

   Lesson 2, learning target 3: I will compose one comprehensive 3-4 sentence paragraph that incorporates two direct quotations of the evidence and answers the CF question: Who started the Cold War, the United States or the Soviet Union? At the end of the first two lessons in the segment, students have read and analyzed four primary source documents – two of which point conclusively to the USSR being chiefly at fault for causing and perpetuating the Cold War (Documents A & B – day 1). And the other two primary sources offer a competing interpretation and evidence that contends the US is to blame for starting and exacerbating the Cold War (Documents C & D – day 2). After reading and analyzing as table groups – with guided questions – students are individually tasked with writing an argumentative paragraph with a claim (argument or thesis), supported with two pieces of unique evidence (i.e. 2 or more sources, direct or indirect quotations) and concluding with a warrant statement which explicitly and logically connects their selected evidence to their argument/claim.

   b. 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 submitted in Assessment Task 3, Part D.
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   c. Provide a graphic (table or chart) or narrative that summarizes student understanding of what they did well and/or needed to improve (student voice).
[Following the formal written assessment (2.3) students completed a two-question, written self-assessment (2.4). The first question asked students to describe how their thinking and perceptions about the Cold War, communism, the USA and the USSR had changed over the two days of reading, analyzing, discussing and writing. As I read through students’ answers, the majority of responses included phrases like “I have learned that the USA had something gain in the Cold War.” Other students shared ideas like “I now can see both sides of it, before I just always thought it was USSR’s fault.” Additionally, some students made insightful connections about the Cold War was called “cold” because there was “no fighting” and the astute analysis that the war as a “media and images war.” Students overwhelmingly wrote that they felt like they had the evidence they needed to expand their thinking, the majority of whom wrote that the activity and evidence changed their minds and that their conclusion is that the US caused and perpetuated the Cold War. Question 2 of the self-assessment and reflection asked students to consider what questions, or confusing details persist for them about the Cold War and/or Communism. Many of their curiosities and questions lingered on the origins and tensions of America v. Communism throughout World War I and the First Red Scare. Four students echoed that sentiment saying they were still confused about “how the US had had an active Communist Party only 25 years prior. What happened?” They self-identified that their content knowledge was missing to better understand how the Great Depression and/or WWII made communism unacceptable in America. 6 students also noted that they “still don’t understand exactly what the purpose of the Cold War was.” One student echoed this confusion asking, “what was gained by the countries spending billions in an arms race?”]

d. Use evidence found in the 3 student work samples, 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 facts and concepts, inquiry, interpretation, or analysis skills, building and supporting arguments or conclusions

[The class on the whole was particularly compelled by primary source documents C & D (lesson 2) to inform the arguments they composed for the written assessment. Each of these primary sources that the students read and analyzed during the second lesson offered evidence and made claims that the US was at fault for initiating and perpetuating the Cold War. This interpretation of the evidence contributed to the strong majority of my students’ arguments. 24 of the 30 students wrote claims asserting the US bears primary responsibility for the start and continuation of the Cold War. Students included evidence, arguments and even precise language from the primary sources C & D to support their claims. Student C and Student B both included the phrase “imperialistic tendencies” to characterize the United States’ actions and to cast blame. Student C also used the evidence that the expansion of the US military footprint around the globe and military base proximity to Russia and other Soviet satellite countries was demonstrative of aggressive action and “inciting the fear and competition.” This use of evidence made for a logical and effective warrant and was an outstanding answer. Student A made a similar argument writing “the US seemed like it was trying to intimidate other countries and largely benefit from the war.” The three sample student assessments reflect much of the shared reasoning across the whole class. The majority of my students’ conclusions reflect the “revisionist” historical lens as opposed to the “traditionalist” historical lens. These terms were introduced to the majority of my students as 10th graders in the World History 4 course during the ‘interview a family member’ about the Cold War project that I described in both Task 1 and Task 2. I wonder how much this activity influenced my students’ favoring one interpretation of the evidence over the other. Even three of the six students who wrote a claim that the USSR is to blame mentioned in both their paragraphs and self-assessments that the US is more to blame than they had previously realized. This majority interpretation of these four primary source documents is evident in all three included student work samples (A, B & C) and in their self reflections. Student A wrote, “I learned a lot more about the benefits the USA got from the war.” Student B noted, “This helps me see two sides since I thought that the USSR was solely responsible.” And Student C reflected “I always thought that the USSR caused the Cold War, and that it was the aggressor but now I see that the US was on the offensive. Before, I didn’t view the US and an imperialistic power b/c it was subtler than Britain’s expansion, per se.” These samples paralleled the self-reflections of the]
class, most of whom noted their change in perspective and that the evidence helped them “to see both sides.” All three included student work samples indicate this shift in thinking and that the readings, analyses and considerations of the sources shifted or expanded their thinking across the two lessons.]

e. What did you learn from student self-reflections on their own learning progress considering their performance on the assessment?

[I learned that my students seem genuinely surprised by their shifts in thinking that the US bears responsibility in the start of the Cold War. I am pleased that they feel like they grew and learned new information. Upon more thorough consideration of their reflection answers however, my major takeaway is that I didn’t entirely ask the right questions. I didn’t ask my students anything about their own performance in writing and constructing the argumentative paragraph. This self reflection is missing a key metacognitive reflection on students’ skills. Instead it only focuses on knowledge. In question 1 I ask them to consider how their thinking has changed and question 2 I ask to consider questions or gaps in their knowledge. Both of those questions I would keep. As I reflected on these data it seems like I am missing information that would have been more helpful to consider student performance and improving on future argumentative writing. I should have asked some question about what additional evidence they needed to better construct their argument. Or I could have included a ranking scale 1-5 much like I did at the closing reflection in lesson one informal self-assessment 1.5. Or I could have asked to describe what aspect of writing the argumentative paragraph was challenging and why. Moreover, as I spend more time with these data, I realized that I should have structured these first two lessons in the segment around a more deliberate pre and post assessment that connected to both skills (i.e. argumentative writing) and prior knowledge (i.e. what students did and did not know about Cold War and Communism). As is happened, my pre-assessment second question was “What was the Cold War about? Why was it ‘cold’? Tell me about where your prior knowledge stems from? (preassessment 1.1). Although this proved to be an interesting conversation starter, it did not entirely support the formal assessment and knowledge or perspective gained across the two lessons. Instead, the first question of the pre-assessment should have been the central focus question itself that way the students could have answered only relying on their prior knowledge. This was a missed opportunity on my part. I could have had the comparative data to see what students knew and how well they could have incorporated prior knowledge as evidence in the claim, evidence, warrant structured paragraph. This is something I will do differently next time. Also, as I considered how many students seemed to be compelled by the evidence and argument in primary sources C & D, it got me considering three possible variables that could explain why the majority of my student answered with the revisionist interpretation and evidence. The first to consider is the possible bias and slant of the materials presented (the truncated primary source documents, the guided questions and structure of the lesson materials). Secondly, I think it is important to consider the zeitgeist and moment that we are in. My students are growing up in a time where they are socially encouraged to be politically active and furthermore to be skeptical about the mythos surrounding the United States, the American Dream and what role the US does or should play on the world stage. Third and finally, doing this lesson in the future, I would like to see how differently students’ written arguments might turn out if I reversed the order of the primary source documents. This way students would finish with documents A & B which lay blame on the USSR. All three of these variables are worth considering and even folding in to student self-reflection questions in the future. And there are likely others that I am also not seeing. One of the fascinating challenges about teaching history in conjunction with teaching the interpretation and analytical skills of historical and argumentative writing is that students are prone (like all people) to draw conclusions from a array of sources, the veracity of which are not always clear or known. That is precisely why it was critical that I include the experiential house of cards activity about confirmation bias to ensure students are diligent and active in their practice as critical thinkers.]
f. If a video or audio work sample and/or self-reflection occurs in a group context (e.g., discussion), provide the name of the clip and clearly describe how the scorer can identify the focus student(s) (e.g., position, physical description) whose work or self-reflection is portrayed.

2. Feedback to Guide Further Learning Refer to specific evidence of submitted feedback to support your explanations.

a. Identify the format in which you submitted your evidence of feedback for the 3 focus students. (Delete choices that do not apply.)

Written directly on work samples or in separate documents that were provided to the focus students [I provided students with hand written feedback in the margins of their formal written assessment 2.3 and alongside their informal self-reflection 2.4]

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

[Student A began with a unique claim compared to their peers. They argued that the US started the Cold War but the Soviet Union benefitted from it. I wrote “claim” in the margins with a check mark and included the word “interesting.” Student A was the only one of my students who wrote a claim like that and I imagined it might be challenging to try and effectively make this argument in only one paragraph. In their evidence section I posed the question in the margin “in which ways $, power, land?” in an effort to encourage them to be more specific when making the statement that the US “largely benefit from the war” but they failed to include specifically how. Next to their final sentence I wrote “warrant?” and underlined it with a highlighter to draw their attention to it. I included these written remarks: “great work incorporating 3 of the sources. Helped to construct the complexity of your argument. Your warrant could be improved by the incorporation of a direct quotation. You chose to make a bold claim which I admire. This is almost there.” At the top of their paragraph I wrote “great work 4/5 approaching, let’s discuss” to clearly spotlight the grade and to each them to come talk with me about my feedback. Student B I wrote claim and check mark next to their claim in the margin, along with evidence that I saw. I wrote a question mark next to the word “documents” that was vague and unclear which documents. Additionally, I wrote “be specific” in the margins regarding the documents. Also, the student used the phrase “documents talk about” and I wrote in the margins that this was “too casual of word choice.” I wanted to encourage more elevated and formal language in student academic writing, especially for these in-class smaller writing assessments. Then my very next note in the margin praises the student for using the phrase “imperialistic tendencies” as effective and incisive language. I also encouraged the student to explain documents using their author’s name as ethos for the claim and why the audience should trust the source. Toward the bottom I have written and highlighted “warrant” where the student’s paragraph ends without a warrant or summary statement. My concluding note reads: “Good references to evidence (paraphrase). I don’t see any warrant. Remember that I want to see that it’s obvious how your evidence proves your claim. Don’t just imply it. Think about how you’d explain it to you little brother.” At the top of the paragraph I wrote “great work 4/5 approaching, good work!” For student C my notes read boldly at the top “5/5 Excellently argued & written!” Again along the margins I used my notes and feedback to applaud and highlight effective ways the students argue. I wrote “yes!” next to the phrase “exhibited imperialistic tendencies” and I wrote ‘great evidence’ next to their example of US military base proximity to Russia. I wrote “clear logical reasoning” next to another of their examples. I applauded them later on in their warrant for using the word “inciting.” I concluded my praise with my final note “Whoa! Outstanding answer. What a thorough incorporation of evidence and potent warrant. Your LA teacher would be impressed with the argumentation.”]
c. Explain how feedback provided to the 3 focus students addresses their individual strengths and needs relative to the learning targets measured.

[Student A made a bold claim and I wanted to applaud them for their effort to try and argue something complex in a short amount of space. They were unable to tie everything together in a cohesive manner and part of that was creating too complex of a claim for only one paragraph. Explaining that concern within my written feedback was something I couldn’t do given the very limited margin space. That’s why I wrote the phrase “let’s discuss” up top next to the grade. So, I wanted to encourage the effort and the recognize that we could address the issues with the warrant and scope of the assignment in person. Student A has a 504 plan for extended time on written assessments and comes to see me regularly for extra time on the written sections of our unit assessments. Moreover, considering the brevity of the already shortened class period (lesson 2), I imagine that Student A felt the time crunch and, in an attempt, to write something clear and concise got anxious, zoomed out a bit too much and began to write too broad of claim. I think we’ll meet in person and it will helpful to have the primary source documents in front of us so they can show me the evidence on the page that inspired them to write a bigger and more nuanced claim. Student B is eager to learn and is always excited about being in class. They are not often able to connect outside of class time. That’s why I wanted to make sure my notes and feedback included a lot of positive comments and what’s right about the assessment and easy to follow corrections and suggestions. This led to my choice in circling with a highlighter my comment applauds the student’s elevated language and word choice. The notes and suggestions for improvement are relatively small and don’t draw huge attention. They are also done in a way that they can read easily and apply the changes on their own time. I am not sure if this student will want to come to office hours and discuss the work. That was also why I made my comment below about “little brother” who I know the student leaves to takes care of after school. I hoped that it would be an invitation for Student B to think of their writing in the methodical and direct way like the ways that they teach and connect with their little brother. Student C is one of the top performing students in the class and has shared with me that they are reticent to speak up in class for fear that they will judged. As such, I wanted to use my feedback to them as an affirmation of their ideas, reasoning and abilities with the hopes of encouraging their confidence and to convey that I am in their corner and that our class is a safe space to share out. Often on written assessments Student C makes incredible insights and is a skilled writer. I feel like as I read their analyses and interpretations that I am led to consider the prompt or concept in a new way based upon their writing. I am impressed with the critical mind and eloquent writing I have seen from Student C.

d. Describe how you will support each focus student to understand and use this feedback to further their learning related to learning targets either within the learning segment or at a later time.

[Student A and I got to sit down together with this assessment to discuss my feedback and to answer their questions. Student A, as I mentioned, comes in regularly to finish writing tasks that they need more time on. I thought that this assessment could be a good opportunity for positive and constructive feedback. They appreciated all of my check marks in the margins and noting the specific places where they met specific criteria. They found that visually helpful. They had a question about warrant and I used a version of explanation that I gave to Student B in the written feedback. I said, “a warrant is explicitly showing me how you connected the dots, dot A is your claim and dot B is your evidence. You can’t just say “hey the dots connect, it’s obvious,” instead you must take your audience along the path that shows them how you got there and why it makes sense that the dots are connected.” The student seemed to respond to that analogy but was also frustrated because they felt like that such a writing style is “redundant and obvious.” I agreed with their point and said that “yes, being obvious and thorough is an essential part of writing like a historian.” My hope is that our meeting with will continue to help them refine and hone their craft as a writer. They made some great connections with evidence and I believe through continued practice they can become more concise and logical in their claim and evidence connections. Student B has not come to see me in person to go
over feedback about the assessment outside of class time. I was however, able to check in with them during class and they appreciated the reference in my notes to taking care of little brother and that the idea was helpful about explaining a warrant and being thorough. As I passed their assessments back I did make a point to remind Student B to be diligent to eliminate casual or colloquial language in academic writing. I will continue to be on watch for other opportunities to give feedback and applaud them for continued work on writing. Student C appreciated my enthusiasm about their paragraph and was honored when I mentioned that I wanted to include it as exemplar in my portfolio. I asked Student C if they had ever considered writing for the school newspaper or literary magazine. I thought that both of these might be ways to encourage and further their talents in writing. Student C mentioned that they are an active member in philosophy club which has been strengthening their logical reasoning and argumentation skills. I responded and affirmed that it was evident and a strength of their writing. I encouraged them to consider also writing free verse poetry and short story creative writing as means to expand their writing strengths through different modes.

3. Evidence of Language Understanding and Use When responding to the prompt below, use concrete examples from the video clips and/or student work samples as evidence. Evidence from the clips may focus on one or more students.

a. Explain and provide concrete examples for the extent to which your students were able to use or struggled to use the selected language function, vocabulary/symbols, AND discourse or syntax to develop content understandings.

[The student work samples analyzed in Assessment Task 3 (i.e. lesson 2.3 written formal assessment) provide complete and thorough evidence of students effectively demonstrating interaction with the language function determine. All three samples of student written work illustrate that each student analyzed and chose evidence (which are essential characteristics of determining). They each composed a logical argument to determine who was primarily responsible for the start of the Cold War, the US or USSR (which is the Central Focus of the lesson segment). Student C for example, demonstrated thorough and accurate evidence of language function and seamless integration of new vocabulary. Student C’s claim reads: “The United States was primarily responsible for starting the Cold War because it not only exhibited imperialistic tendencies by securing bases near Russia’s coastlines but it also started the arms race by continuing to produce bombs and test them after the war.” Student C excelled in this task and clearly incorporated two pieces of evidence regarding US military investment and posturing following WII which demonstrated this student’s selection of evidence, use and understanding of language in all three regards. First, Student C’s examples logically support the claim which is demonstrative of the language function determine. Secondly, by including this evidence in their argument, they demonstrate a nuanced understanding of the vocabulary term “Cold War” which, per the student’s evidence, appears hotter than its name suggests which adds to the complexity of their understanding of the term. And third, the student’s understanding is expressly conveyed using the written discourse, the argumentative written paragraph. In addition to “Cold War,” Student C accurately identifies and incorporates additional vocabulary words within their written discourse. Student C refers to Novikov and Wallace, authors of the primary sources (documents C & D) accurately which provides ethos for the evidence. What’s more, Student C used the phrase “thus inciting the fear and competition” which was a direct reference from the day before to the lesson one vocabulary syntax, the Communism/Capitalism Venn diagram (student handout 1.2). This was outstanding use of new vocabulary and demonstrative of the student’s mastery of the content. The oral discourse occurred in preparation of the composition of this formal written assessment. Students shared out their hypotheses from lesson one within their table groups to share ideas about the best selections of evidence to support their claims. Although that language support was undocumented (due to the altered Student Walkout schedule) it likely played a helpful role in students being able to share out, refine their evidence and build an effective claim. Student A struggled a little with the language function determine however, as they were not able to determine solitary blame on either the US or USSR. This fact complicated
their claim and the written assessment suffered because of it. Student A’s claim was: “The United States started the Cold War but the Soviet Union definitely benefitted from it” confirms that they had trouble determining one side’s sole responsibility. Student A does include vocabulary terms Churchill and Novikov in the same sentence and without clear connection to specific evidence which makes it is unclear that the student fully understands what these men’s positions are or how they best support the student’s claim. It is likely however, that considering the time constraints and Student A’s challenges with longer form writing, that this writing discourse was not the most useful tool for this student to organize their thoughts and present clear evidence of understanding and effective use of vocabulary.

4. Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

a. Based on your analysis of student learning and student self-reflections presented in prompts 1b–e, describe next steps for planning and instruction to impact student learning: for the whole class, for the 3 focus students and other individuals/groups with specific needs.

As far as skill building from this lesson segment is concerned, I think I need to build in deliberate instruction time for students to practice construction of argumentative analysis writing. Those opportunities should include students reading and analyzing effective argumentative paragraphs as a first step. That would help students to begin recognizing what effective, realistic and provable claims look like, how to incorporate and paraphrase evidence and most importantly, recognizing and understanding warranting a claim. I think Student C’s paragraph could serve as an exemplar to share with my students in such a workshop. The depth of analysis, integration of logical evidence and the deliberate connection of that evidence to their claim would serve as a great model. Teaching these writing skills in our classes is often talked about within the social studies department meetings. Our 12th grade government teachers routinely say that these argumentative writing skills in particular are lacking in the 12th grade students they inherit each year. As I reflect back on the overwhelming majority of students in my class who received a 4/5 on the assessment (class average was 4.26), it was mostly because they had vague and unclear war warrants or didn’t include one at all. The use of this terminology “warrant” is new to the social studies department this year and I am not surprised that our students were unfamiliar with it in their feedback, let alone know what it really means to write a warrant. I need to work with our department writing PLC (professional learning community) to develop small batch lessons to practice warrant recognition and writing. I know our school librarian and tech specialist (a former LA teacher) is interested in working with social studies on improving student writing skills. Our students’ 9th and 10th grade experiences with DBQs (document-based questions) and strategies like ‘quote sandwich’ contribute to formulaic and incomplete writing evident in my data with examples like “Doc B proves my point.” Moreover, as I mentioned, 19 of these 30 students are in AP Language Arts and the historical style of writing (i.e. claim, evidence, warrant) is different for many of my students and seemed “obvious and redundant” as Student A mentioned in our debrief about their assessment. Additionally, my practice can be improved considering Student A and others who would benefit from more instructional time and in-class time devoted to writing. Likely Student A felt rushed with the limited time during lesson 2 and was unable to put together a cohesive argument in the time allotted. It is going to take careful planning to ensure that my cooperating teacher and I can balance scheduling the skill building work periods into the remainder of the year. It feels like a challenge in a survey course filled with so much content, as is the case with the US History course. I know that deliberate writing workshop days, both for analyzing examples and students creating their own writing examples would be helpful for Student C and other students like them to be able to get feedback from me in real time to grow their practice and feel challenged by longer and more complex arguments. Likely, based upon their performance and mastery of the formal assessment (2.3) such assessment could be personalized to be more challenging for advanced writers like Student C. Student B could benefit from in-class workshop writing because, as I mentioned, they are often not available for out of class time help. I think their writing could improve with more immediate in the moment feedback and be able to respond to questions in
person about language choice – in the case of the informal use of the phrase “both documents talk.” Moreover, writing workshop during class time, where students already sit in table groups, could make use of peer feedback as a strategy that all of my students could benefit from. As far as the student self-reflections are concerned, I missed the opportunity for thorough metacognitive reflection about the skills of the task (i.e. argumentative writing) and additionally, my curiosities about uncovering why students were disproportionately convinced and argued the claim that the US is to blame for the Cold War. Additionally, I think I need a tighter and faster feedback loop. Perhaps that means transforming these current paper exit ticket to a Kahoot survey or Google form that students could fill out on their phones. This would lead to quicker organization and ultimately more efficient digestion of the data. I could really be prepared to use this information at the start of the next day. Student B for example wrote in response to the questions/confusions after their writing assessment (Q2 on informal self assessment 2.4) “how did all this tension start?” My immediate reaction was confusion because as I interpreted the question I thought that the past two days of instruction, activity, reading and the written assessment would have provided them some sense of how it (presumably the Cold War) all started. But as I wrote in the margins “America v. Communism? – we can go back and look @ WWI.” So, it was unclear, based on this reflection, where the student’s confused lay. If I had more immediate opportunity to address student confusions I could close these gaps in concepts and knowledge. Additionally, I think I would plan for more time to debrief the students’ self-reflections at the start of the next lesson. I was so eager to dive in to lesson 3 that I think I missed the opportunity to better understand what caused students’ thinking to change so much and from their previous narratives about the Cold War and to learn from them why the sources (documents C & D) were so transformative. For example, Student C wrote (Q1 on informal self-assessment 2.4) “I always thought the USSR cause the Cold War and it was the aggressor.” In the margins next to it I wrote “Why?” I think this would have been a great opportunity to promote student metacognition through oral discourse and uncover what about the exercise, evidence or other factors contributed to this evolution of their thinking. This would be especially relevant considering so many students cited this transformation of thought and argued the way they did in the assessment.]

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

[As I consider the role and responsibility I have as a social studies teacher to structure space and time to teach and practice writing, I recognize that I have to break out of the mold and pressure of content delivery. Skills building like reading, analyzing, writing, arguing like a historian are ultimately the more important takeaways from my courses than are the factual recall and memorization. My goal is to produce critical thinkers and articulate communicators of complex ideas and not simply to produce proficient Jeopardy contestants. Tools like the interactive student notebook (i.e. online textbook and guiding lessons/questions) can help to ‘flip the classroom’ and drive student independent practice of new content outside of class time. A strategy like this can offer more flexibility and design of my classroom for practice and writing workshop opportunities. The workshop model of working together and peer editing and feedback is supported in educational research both Dewey’s research on experiential learning and authentic practice for the skills of the working world. In the workforce today, students need to be effective communicators (oral and written) and to collaborate and be able to give and receive constructive feedback. Such pedagogy is further supported by Vygotsky in his work about socio-cultural learning and group work. Peer editing can be a chance for students to interact and also to change their thinking about who is reading their writing and put them in a receiver-oriented communication mindset as they write. I am also intrigued by the emerging research behind blended, personalized and digital learning. Catlin Tucker is a Language Arts teacher and leader in the field and argues for the implementation of a paradigm shift towards mastery grading which could aid students and teachers especially where feedback on longer form writing assignments is concerned. Teachers should, Tucker argues be giving consistent feedback early on in the writing process and not waiting until the final draft and trying to write copious amount of feedback for an assignment that is essentially ‘over’ in the student’s mind. Moreover, feedback throughout
makes writing more of an authentic assessment. Rarely, will students produce work in their adult lives where they will only get one chance to submit without feedback or opportunity to refine or improve it. We don’t prepare our students to be thoughtful recipients of constructive feedback if we don’t create those opportunities to take in and learn from feedback in a safe and structured environment. The earlier I could give feedback to my students in their writing the lower the stakes and the more efficient the production. Tucker wrote recently about the use of digital voice notes to give students feedback on informal and formal writing tasks. This strategy saves teachers time and simultaneously improves student’s digital literacy. I am intrigued by the add-on within Google docs that would make this kind of feedback possible. An additional strategy within the blended learning toolbox that could increase these opportunities for meaningful in-class writing workshops is the station rotation model which can reduce the teacher to student ratio for more in depth and targeted direct instruction or feedback as other students work independently on other aspects of writing. Moreover, if I have more time with each student for personalized feedback, I can meet them at their skill level and address what Vygotsky calls the student’s zone of proximal development (ZPD) to focus in on the particular, relevant areas where they can improve.]

c. Identify any proposed revisions in tools/strategies for collecting what students thought they did well and/or needed to improve (student voice), providing a rationale for why revisions were or were not needed.

[Student voice and reflection could be improved in numerous ways throughout this lesson segment. Specifically, I think the paper exit ticket could be transformed into a Kahoot survey or Google form for more effective processing and data crunching. As paper slips mixed in with a lot of other student papers – at least in lessons 1 and 2 – it became an inefficient way for me to get students reflections. Although I would keep nearly all of the reflection and self-assessment questions that I posed to students across the five lessons, there are key questions I forgot to ask in the first two lessons in particular. A critical misstep on my part was not including the Central Focus question (i.e. Who is responsible for starting the Cold War, the US or Soviet Union?) in the opening preassessment (1.1) with the evaluation of student’s prior knowledge. I asked students to consider what they knew and why they believed their sources to be reliable. These were effective metacognitive questions and also connected to the ideas at the heart of this segment about being a skeptical and discerning thinker and not just blindly following what one is told. So, I believe those questions have a place in framing the beginning of this lesson segment. However, if I had included the central focus question in the opening activity preassessment (1.1), also in the closing reflection of lesson one (1.5) and again after the written assessment at the end of the second lesson (2.4), there would have been uniform opportunities for students to reflect and consider how and why their learned occurred. They could have tracked and address specifically if and why their argument changed regarding the central focus question. Additionally, I could have more understanding about why exactly so many students argued that the US is to blame for the Cold War. Another area where I would improve opportunities for student voice would be in the sharing out following lesson 2. The structure of the strange school week schedule during lesson segment created the shortened period at exactly the wrong spot. Were I to do it all over again I would ideally have five 50-minute class periods to work with. I think I would still structure lesson one the same but I would allot more time during lesson two for composition of writing argumentative paragraphs (formal assessment 2.3) and also include time oral discourse in conjunction with the informal self-assessment (2.4). Then I could have gathered evidence as whole class about why so many students were influenced by documents and to get a better sense about how student understandings of the Cold War and Communism had changed through the two-day primary source document analysis and argumentative writing. There were effective strategies for promoting student voice like the structure of four-student table groups throughout the entire lesson segment and the numerous opportunities for individual written discourse and small group oral discourse that showed up in every lesson. As I look back on my student voice data I believe that most well-structured moments for meaningful student voice through written and oral discourse came at the conclusion of the house of cards activity in lesson 3. Students got to describe their experiences in the simulation by applying the new vocabulary terms
(groupthink, confirmation bias, hysteria) to their experience and also connect their emotional experience to that of Second Red Scare. That reflection opportunity helped to make the simulation and meaningful opportunity for learning. Furthermore, the extension homework activity, which was notably, the only homework assignment throughout the lesson segment, proved to be another opportunity for language support and for students to consider the relevance of the lesson and those concepts in their lives and the world today.]