

ILA HISTORY METACOGNITION SCORING GUIDE

PREPARATION TO SCORE

Recall your own reading of documents 2 and 3 and the discussion about the kinds of thinking processes involved in making sense of these texts.

Note that the documents selected for the Integrated Learning Assessment are complex enough to require some thought and problem solving on the part of even very skillful readers.

SCORING PROCESS

What are we looking for?

Degree of student metacognition; that is, the degree to which students give evidence of thinking about the thinking processes involved in reading these documents.

You will be reviewing student responses to the metacognitive prompts that follow documents 2 and 3 in order to score the strength of students' ability to be metacognitive about their reading.

Each metacognitive response (page 7 and page 9) will be given a separate score.

Metacognition includes the following aspects:

- ***awareness of one's thinking*** (ability to describe the content and course of one's thinking about the text)
- ***monitoring of one's comprehension*** (ability to identify roadblocks to understanding that require attention), and
- ***deliberate control (guidance) of thinking and problem solving processes*** (ability to marshal comprehension strategies and put them to purposeful use to resolve difficulties, restore comprehension, or deepen engagement with the text).

Students will have answered the comprehension questions before writing about their metacognition on pages 7 and 9 of Part II. Do not refer to their answers to the comprehension questions at all while scoring their metacognitive responses.

Similarly, students may also have annotated the documents. Students' repertoire of strategy use is scored separately. Do not refer to annotations or lack of annotations in scoring students' responses to the metacognitive prompts.

ILA HISTORY METACOGNITION SCORING GUIDE

Finally, although monitoring comprehension typically includes the ability to assess the strength of one's understanding, we will not attempt to score the accuracy of student self-assessments. Therefore, it is possible for a student with poor comprehension to receive a high score for metacognition, as long as his/her responses to the prompts provide evidence of strong awareness, monitoring and guidance of the reading and thinking processes involved in reading of these documents.

Criteria for rating metacognition

Responses will be scored holistically. In general, metacognitive responses will vary according to:

- the degree to which reading and thinking processes are **apparent**,
- the **specificity** with which complexities in the text and/or its ideas are identified,
- the degree to which the reading process appears **guided and purposeful**, and
- the evidence of thinking processes that occur at **multiple points** (showing ongoing metacognition) during the reading.

Prompt #1 – Question 4 from pg. 7 of Assessment Part 2

4. Parts of this document were complex. What did you do as you were reading to improve your understanding? Please be as detailed as possible.

EXAMPLES OF A SCORE OF 1: A response receiving a 1 is either blank or offers no evidence of metacognitive awareness, monitoring, or guidance of thinking. Simply asserting understanding or lack of understanding without elaboration is not sufficient evidence of metacognition and receives a score of 1. For example:

I just read it.

I didn't do anything. I understood it by just reading it.

I understood the whole thing.

It wasn't hard to read.

ILA HISTORY METACOGNITION SCORING GUIDE

EXAMPLES OF A SCORE OF 2: A response receiving a 2 makes only vague reference to complexities in the text and may name a topic of thought or a comprehension strategy invoked without offering a description of thinking processes or purposes. A 2 response provides little evidence of guided and purposeful reading.

I kind of put myself into the situation.

In order to better understand the passage I read it twice.

Read the questions first.

I was putting more attention to the paper.

highlight things

EXAMPLES OF 3: A response receiving a 3 responds to at least one complexity in the text and shows evidence of a guided, purposeful reading and thinking process, but may provide little detail about thinking processes that occur during reading or little evidence of thinking processes that occur at multiple points during the reading. For example:

If I didn't understand a line, I reread it. If I still didn't get it, I read on and went back to it later.

I looked back at the historical time period and context, and figured out what he was referring to.

I underlined certain sentences and tried to understand them. I analyzed each word carefully and saw how it related to the meaning of the paragraph.

I read the story twice and I read the question and went back to reading so I could make sure I had the right answer.

I read the questions first to know or have an idea of what I was looking for. Also, I tried to remember anything that seemed important.

EXAMPLES OF 4: A response receiving a 4 engages with specific complexities or ideas in the text and shows evidence of more than one approach to guided reading and thinking that is ongoing and involves multiple places in the text. For example:

In order to improve my understanding I underlined and circled key phrases that had caught my attention. I also write little commentaries and translations to help me to have a better understanding of the document.

ILA HISTORY METACOGNITION SCORING GUIDE

I finished reading the document and annotated it, then I went back over it and added more notes that answered the questions I had about certain parts of the document. This really helped me fully understand the document.

I tried to understand the general idea first by quickly reading the text. Then I went back and tried to understand what the speaker was saying. Then I tried to understand why and what led up to him saying these things. Once I understood his position, I tried to connect that idea with the general history of the US and some common themes.

While I was reading, I kept re-thinking what he was trying to say. He asked several questions, in which I had to re-read to understand why he was asking and the true meaning of his questions.

Prompt #2 – Question 4 from pg. 9 of Assessment Part 2

4. What did you do and think about as you were answering question number 3 on this page?
Please be as detailed as possible.

EXAMPLES OF A SCORE OF 1: A response receiving a 1 is either blank or offers no evidence of metacognitive awareness, monitoring, or guidance of thinking. Simply asserting understanding or lack of understanding without any elaboration is not sufficient evidence of metacognition and receives a score of 1.

Not much I didn't really understand the question.

Why would you ask how a question makes us feel?

I didn't really understand what they were getting at. The question was kind of confusing.

I just tried to pick the best answer.

EXAMPLES OF A SCORE OF 2: A response receiving a 2 makes only vague reference to complexities in the text and may name a topic of thought or a comprehension strategy invoked without offering a description of thinking processes or purposes. A 2 response provides little evidence of guided and purposeful reading. For example:

I guess because I did not know

I was thinking about how there were still lynchings going on during World War II. I was also looking at the "240 racial incidents" in the first line.

ILA HISTORY METACOGNITION SCORING GUIDE

I don't really understand the question but as to racial violence I think about how horrible it must have been for African Americans back in the days.

I was thinking about the hardships the country endured at the time making victor even harder to achieve.

I thought about "the double VV" meaning win the war at home and abroad (racially).

I thought about the racial violence.

EXAMPLES OF 3: A response receiving a 3 responds to at least one complexity in the text and shows evidence of a guided, purposeful reading and thinking process, but may provide little detail about thinking processes that occur during reading or little evidence of thinking processes that occur at multiple points during the reading. For example:

"The second victory in the previous passage was to end discrimination. Option "D" is the only one the demonstrates the battle within the USA."

I was trying to remember exactly what the double VV meant, and I remember it was about fighting racial discrimination, there I chose answer C.

Trying to figure out which answer had a meaning for a double victory.

When answering number 3 on this page, I went back to the previous passage & reread what it had said. Then I was able to answer the question.

I was basically just thinking about what I learned about with civil rights battles through history. Just kind of making an educated guess with my background knowledge.

EXAMPLES OF 4: A response receiving a 4 engages with specific complexities or ideas in the text and shows evidence of more than one approach to guided reading and thinking that is ongoing and involves multiple places in the text. For example:

I eliminated the obvious wrong answers B & D. I thought about the reading and it didn't prove the U.S. could not win both wars. The reading stated the tensions were exacerbated by wartime migration – C.

I was thinking about how Thompson saw the war as an opportunity for change and destruction of racism at home, and how that contrasted w/Wynn's account of the increased racial conflict due to the war.

ILA HISTORY METACOGNITION SCORING GUIDE

First I tried to eliminate the most obviously wrong answers. Then I tried to connect the founding ideas of America with the efforts of those at war. Once I thought about that and American hypocrisy, I came up with C.

I thought about the information I read on the previous page and thought about how racial violence could relate to the double VV for double victory. I also eliminated answers to make answering the question easier.

The double VV for double victory meant that African Americans were fighting a war against Japan and also an internal problem that they faced during WWII which was to put an end to discrimination and prejudice. I read the passage and thought about how it would be helpful to use this occasion to straighten issues in the United States.