



Panel Review Protocol (Longer Version)

This panel review protocol is designed to support exchanges among a small teams of teachers and begins with a close description of the student work sample.



Set up the panel with the following roles and order of activity: facilitator, presenting teacher(s), panelists, observers, order of process, vocabulary of process,

PART 1 - 20 minutes

Confirm that all parts of the sample have been produced by students, then hear the presenting teacher describe the age level of the student and name, but not explain, the components of the sample. To review the student work sample:

1. Use **Panel Review: Panelist Description & Scoring Tool** to silently take notes about what meets your senses as you view/read the sample of student work
2. Share your description with your table group (panel) adding one observation per person making as many circuits of the panel as you need for your description. Coach panelists to recognize contributions by colleagues similar to their own by saying “ditto,” and to immediately address observations that are hard to see by asking the observer, “what in the sample makes you say that?”
3. When the panel is satisfied with its description, provide time for panelists to write down questions about the unit. Share selected questions, contributing one question at a time. Ask for a recorder to briefly document these questions.
4. Speculate alone and then with your panel colleagues about the student learning asking:
 - a. What might the overarching big idea of this unit have been?
 - b. What contents areas are visible in this sample?
 - c. What learning resulted from this unit? What do you think the classroom learning goals were about?
5. Again, contribute these one-by-one around the panel and ask for a recorder to briefly document these questions.

PART 2 - 10 minutes



Panel Review Protocol (Longer Version)

After notating the panelists' conjectures of the learning represented in the sample, the facilitator passes out the planning guide summary for the selected unit. Panelists use the summary to respond to these questions:

1. Compare the list of **assessment products** and the sample of student work. Does the sample of student work include all the products listed in the summary? If the sample includes different products, what is added or not included? Is there anything obvious in the sample to disregard or trade-off against other features.
2. How do the **big idea, benchmarks and learning goals** stated in the summary correspond to the panel's speculation about the learning that was happening based on their description of the work sample?
3. Use the written description of the **assessment activity** in the planning guide and the sample of student work to identify the **STRENGTHS** of this assessment activity based on the qualities listed in the four boxes below:
4. Panelists share the strength they identified and the features of the assessment activities they relied on that supports this strength

The assessment activity elicits rich evidence of student learning	The activity provides students with feedback at useful moments to improve learning
Students are in charge of their own learning and are provided with real world connections, such as relationships and resources outside the school	Students act as resources for each other

Bell, C., Steinberg, J., Wiliam, D., & Wylie, C. (2008). *Formative assessment student achievement: Two years of implementation of the Keeping Learning on Track® program*. Paper. New York, NY: National Council on Measurement in Education



Panel Review Protocol (Longer Version)

Marzano, R.J. (2006). Classroom assessment & grading that work. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.



Panel Review Protocol (Longer Version)

PART 3 - 10 minutes

Return to the **evaluative criteria** written in the planning guide summary (if available) to:

1. Read the evaluative criteria and examine the relationship between the criteria and the learning goal by asking: Does the criteria address the point of the learning goal? In what ways?
2. Apply the criteria described in the planning guide, or those you choose to use, to evaluate the level of proficiency represented in the sample. Compare each product with its evaluative criteria.
3. For each student product being reviewed, the group simultaneously offers its score (show of fingers or a number).
4. After noting the degree of variation in the group panelists explain their ratings to their panel colleagues referencing specific evidence in the sample.

Part 4 - 10 minutes

*The Presenting Teachers are always in the driver's seat. They reflect on their written responses to the panel review by looking over the notes they've taken in the **Panel Review: Presenting Team Tool** and responding to what the panel has discussed using these questions:*

- a. What insights did you have based on the descriptions the panel made?*
- b. What questions raised by the panel were most interesting to you, and why?*
- c. What do you appreciate more now about your teaching and learning strategies? What would you modify?*

Panel: Listen and allow time for the presenting teachers to process the above questions without interruption.



Panel Review Protocol (Longer Version)

Panel Review Glossary:

Trade-off

Panelists decide to trade-off features present in the student work that speak directly to the learning goal over features that don't speak as directly. Panelists may choose to emphasize such features, or to weigh them more significantly in their evaluation. As individual panelists suggest trade-offs the entire panel works to come to consensus about what is traded and why.

Disregard

To read a sample more clearly, panelists decide to disregard features, or parts, of the student work sample. If a panel is able to come to consensus about a suggestion to disregard as aspect of a student work sample, then that aspect is entirely removed from consideration.

Tap-in

Sometimes it is useful for large groups of teachers to participate in their review of a collection of student work. A sample of student work resulting from a common assessment in a large district with many schools may result in a roomful of teachers with a stake in the outcome of the review. In such a case, the five panelists reviewing the work can be augmented by the voices of non-panelist teachers by tapping in. Non-panelist participants tap the shoulder of a panelist who relinquishes her/his seat for the duration of the non-participant's contribution to the review conversation. When the contribution is complete the original panelist resumes her/his place in the panel.

Observers

As described earlier, there may be good reasons to convene a large group of teachers with an interest in the outcome of a review. Another way to accommodate additional teachers is to assign non-panelist members of the group specific jobs related to the goals of the review. For example, non-panelist observers may be asked to:

- evaluate the content of the conversation by asking if the issues the panelists are addressing are at the heart of the profession
- give feedback to the panel about its work to come to consensus: was it too easy to agree, did people hold out unreasonably, or did the effort to come to consensus lead to deeper



Panel Review Protocol (Longer Version)

understandings?

- observe and comment on the quality of professional respect apparent in the conversations by asking if all voices were invited and accommodated, or if some voices dominated
- summarize the significance of the panel review for a particular population of students, or larger organizational need: what larger patterns does this review shed new light on?