

Module 5
Participant Guide

Focus on Deepening
Implementation

Activity 3a

Connecticut Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy



Grades 6–12

Systems of Professional Learning

Connecticut Core Standards Systems of Professional Learning

The material in this guide was developed by Public Consulting Group in collaboration with staff from the Connecticut State Department of Education and the RESC Alliance. The development team would like to specifically thank Ellen Cohn, Charlene Tate Nichols, and Jennifer Webb from the Connecticut State Department of Education; Leslie Abbatiello from ACES; and Robb Geier, Elizabeth O’Toole, and Cheryl Liebling from Public Consulting Group.

The Systems of Professional Learning project includes a series of professional learning experiences for Connecticut Core Standards District Coaches in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Humanities, Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM), and Student/Educator Support Staff (SESS).

Participants will have continued support for the implementation of the new standards through virtual networking opportunities and online resources to support the training of educators throughout the state of Connecticut.

Instrumental in the design and development of the Systems of Professional Learning materials from PCG were: Sharon DeCarlo, Debra Berlin, Mary Ellen Hannon, Jennifer McGregor, Judy Buck, Michelle Wade, Nora Kelley, Diane Stump, and Melissa Pierce.

Published 2014. Available online at <http://ctcorestandards.org/>



Part 3: Assessing Written Curriculum with the EQuIP Rubric

Part 3: Assessing Written Curriculum with the EQuIP Rubric

Activity 3a: Building Expertise with the EQuIP Rubric

DESCRIPTION

Using a jigsaw approach, participants will read, discuss, and build expertise on one section of the EQuIP Rubric and share with their table groups.

DIRECTIONS

1. Participants at each table group will be assigned a dimension of the EQuIP Rubric by the facilitator. The dimensions will be: 1) Depth and Rigor of CCS; 2) Key Shifts in the CCS; 3) Instructional Support; and, 4) Assessment.
2. Read and discuss the assigned EQuIP Rubric dimension, becoming experts in that area.
3. When completed, put the number of your table group on a sticky note. When prompted by the facilitator, “remix with others” and form new groups of four representing each dimension in the EQuIP Rubric.
4. Each “expert” will share key understandings of their assigned dimension with other members of the group.

Discussion Prompt: (Reminder, Notepad is available on page 36 to capture your thoughts.)



How can the EQuIP Rubric assist teachers in developing a deeper understanding of their CCS-aligned curriculum?

RESOURCES

- EQuIP Rubric. Retrieved from <http://www.achieve.org/EQuIP>

Grade: Literacy Lesson/Unit Title:

Overall Rating:

I. Alignment to the Depth of the CCSS	II. Key Shifts in the CCSS	III. Instructional Supports	IV. Assessment
<p><i>The lesson/unit aligns with the letter and spirit of the CCSS:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Targets a set of grade-level CCSS ELA/Literacy standards. ○ Includes a clear and explicit purpose for instruction. ○ Selects text(s) that measure within the grade-level text complexity band and are of sufficient quality and scope for the stated purpose (e.g., presents vocabulary, syntax, text structures, levels of meaning/purpose, and other qualitative characteristics similar to CCSS grade-level exemplars in Appendices A & B). <p><u>A unit or longer lesson should:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Integrate reading, writing, speaking and listening so that students apply and synthesize advancing literacy skills. ○ (Grades 3-5) Build students' content knowledge and their understanding of reading and writing in social studies, the arts, science or technical subjects through the coherent selection of texts. 	<p><i>The lesson/unit addresses key shifts in the CCSS:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reading Text Closely: Makes reading text(s) closely, examining textual evidence, and discerning deep meaning a central focus of instruction. ○ Text-Based Evidence: Facilitates rich and rigorous evidence-based discussions and writing about common texts through a sequence of specific, thought-provoking, and text-dependent questions (including, when applicable, questions about illustrations, charts, diagrams, audio/video, and media). ○ Writing from Sources: Routinely expects that students draw evidence from texts to produce clear and coherent writing that informs, explains, or makes an argument in various written forms (e.g., notes, summaries, short responses, or formal essays). ○ Academic Vocabulary: Focuses on building students' academic vocabulary in context throughout instruction. <p><u>A unit or longer lesson should:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increasing Text Complexity: Focus students on reading a progression of complex texts drawn from the grade-level band. Provide text-centered learning that is sequenced, scaffolded and supported to advance students toward independent reading of complex texts at the CCR level. ○ Building Disciplinary Knowledge: Provide opportunities for students to build knowledge about a topic or subject through analysis of a coherent selection of strategically sequenced, discipline-specific texts. ○ Balance of Texts: Within a collection of grade-level units a balance of informational and literary texts is included according to guidelines in the CCSS (p. 5). ○ Balance of Writing: Include a balance of on-demand and process writing (e.g., multiple drafts and revisions over time) and short, focused research projects, incorporating digital texts where appropriate. 	<p><i>The lesson/unit is responsive to varied student learning needs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cultivates student interest and engagement in reading, writing and speaking about texts. ○ Addresses instructional expectations and is easy to understand and use. ○ Provides <i>all</i> students with multiple opportunities to engage with text of appropriate complexity for the grade level; includes appropriate scaffolding so that students directly experience the complexity of the text. ○ Focuses on challenging sections of text(s) and engages students in a productive struggle through discussion questions and other supports that build toward independence. ○ Integrates appropriate supports in reading, writing, listening and speaking for students who are ELL, have disabilities, or read well below the grade level text band. ○ Provides extensions and/or more advanced text for students who read well above the grade level text band. <p><u>A unit or longer lesson should:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include a progression of learning where concepts and skills advance and deepen over time (<i>may be more applicable across the year or several units</i>). ○ Gradually remove supports, requiring students to demonstrate their independent capacities (<i>may be more applicable across the year or several units</i>). ○ Provide for authentic learning, application of literacy skills, student-directed inquiry, analysis, evaluation and/or reflection. ○ Integrate targeted instruction in such areas as grammar and conventions, writing strategies, discussion rules and all aspects of foundational reading for grades 3-5. ○ Indicate how students are accountable for independent reading based on student choice and interest to build stamina, confidence and motivation (<i>may be more applicable across the year or several units</i>). ○ Use technology and media to deepen learning and draw attention to evidence and texts as appropriate. 	<p><i>The lesson/unit regularly assesses whether students are mastering standards-based content and skills:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elicits direct, observable evidence of the degree to which a student can independently demonstrate the major targeted grade-level CCSS standards with appropriately complex text(s). ○ Assesses student proficiency using methods that are unbiased and accessible to all students. ○ Includes aligned rubrics or assessment guidelines that provide sufficient guidance for interpreting student performance. <p><u>A unit or longer lesson should:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use varied modes of assessment, including a range of pre-, formative, summative and self-assessment measures.
<p>Rating: 3 2 1 0</p>	<p>Rating: 3 2 1 0</p>	<p>Rating: 3 2 1 0</p>	<p>Rating: 3 2 1 0</p>

EQulP Rubric for Lessons & Units: ELA/Literacy (Grades 3-5) and ELA (Grades 6-12)

Directions: The Quality Review Rubric provides criteria to determine the quality and alignment of lessons and units to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in order to: (1) Identify exemplars/ models for teachers' use within and across states; (2) provide constructive criteria-based feedback to developers; and (3) review existing instructional materials to determine what revisions are needed.

Step 1 – Review Materials

- Record the grade and title of the lesson/unit on the recording form.
- Scan to see what the lesson/unit contains and how it is organized.
- Read key materials related to instruction, assessment and teacher guidance.
- Study and measure the text(s) that serves as the centerpiece for the lesson/unit, analyzing text complexity, quality, scope, and relationship to instruction.

Step 2 – Apply Criteria in Dimension I: Alignment

- Identify the grade-level CCSS that the lesson/unit targets.
- Closely examine the materials through the “lens” of each criterion.
- Individually check each criterion for which clear and substantial evidence is found.
- Identify and record input on specific improvements that might be made to meet criteria or strengthen alignment.
- Enter your rating 0 – 3 for Dimension I: Alignment

Note: Dimension I is non-negotiable. In order for the review to continue, a rating of 2 or 3 is required. If the review is discontinued, consider general feedback that might be given to developers/teachers regarding next steps.

Step 3 – Apply Criteria in Dimensions II – IV

- Closely examine the lesson/unit through the “lens” of each criterion.
- Record comments on criteria met, improvements needed and then rate 0 – 3.

When working in a group, individuals may choose to compare ratings after each dimension or delay conversation until each person has rated and recorded their input for the remaining Dimensions II – IV.

Step 4 – Apply an Overall Rating and Provide Summary Comments

- Review ratings for Dimensions I – IV adding/clarifying comments as needed.
- Write summary comments for your overall rating on your recording sheet.
- Total dimension ratings and record overall rating E, E/I, R, N – adjust as necessary.

If working in a group, individuals should record their overall rating prior to conversation.

Step 5 – Compare Overall Ratings and Determine Next Steps

- Note the evidence cited to arrive at final ratings, summary comments and similarities and differences among raters. Recommend next steps for the lesson/unit and provide recommendations for improvement and/or ratings to developers/teachers.

Additional Guidance for ELA/Literacy – When selecting text(s) that measure within the grade-level text complexity band and are of sufficient quality and scope for the stated purpose, see *The Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts/Literacy* at www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy; and the *Supplement for Appendix A: New Research on Text Complexity as well as Quantitative and Qualitative Measures* at www.achievethecore.org/steal-these-tools/text-complexity. See *The Publishers' Criteria* for Grades K-2 and the same for Grades 3-12 at www.achievethecore.org/steal-these-tools.

Rating Scales

Note: Rating for Dimension I: Alignment is non-negotiable and requires a rating of 2 or 3. If rating is 0 or 1 then the review does not continue.

Rating Scale for Dimensions I, II, III, IV:

3: Meets most to all of the criteria in the dimension

2: Meets many of the criteria in the dimension

1: Meets some of the criteria in the dimension

0: Does not meet the criteria in the dimension

Descriptors for Dimensions I, II, III, IV:

3: Exemplifies CCSS Quality – meets the standard described by criteria in the dimension, as explained in criterion-based observations.

2: Approaching CCSS Quality – meets many criteria but will benefit from revision in others, as suggested in criterion-based observations.

1: Developing toward CCSS Quality – needs significant revision, as suggested in criterion-based observations.

0: Not representing CCSS Quality – does not address the criteria in the dimension.

Overall Rating for the Lesson/Unit:

E: Exemplar – Aligned and meets most to all of the criteria in dimensions II, III, IV **(total 11 – 12)**

E/I: Exemplar if Improved – Aligned and needs some improvement in one or more dimensions **(total 8 – 10)**

R: Revision Needed – Aligned partially and needs significant revision in one or more dimensions **(total 3 – 7)**

N: Not Ready to Review – Not aligned and does not meet criteria **(total 0 – 2)**

Descriptors for Overall Rating:

E: Exemplifies CCSS Quality – Aligned and exemplifies the quality standard and exemplifies most of the criteria across Dimensions II, III, IV of the rubric.

E/I: Approaching CCSS Quality – Aligned and exemplifies the quality standard in some dimensions but will benefit from some revision in others.

R: Developing toward CCSS Quality – Aligned partially and approaches the quality standard in some dimensions and needs significant revision in others.

N: Not representing CCSS Quality – Not aligned and does not address criteria.