

Module 1
Participant
Guide

Focus on Instructional Shifts

Activity 5

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, Jennifer McGregor, Michelle Wade, Nora Kelley, Diane Stump, and Melissa Pierce.

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



Activity 5

Activity 5: Bringing It All Together—Using the EQuIP Rubric to Assess Alignment

DESCRIPTION

In table groups, coaches will use the EQuIP Rubric to assess the extent to which a video lesson and its accompanying lesson plan align with the features of CCS-ELA instructional shifts. As a group, you will view an entire lesson and determine which features of aligned instruction are clearly evident. (You may not be able to assess all elements of aligned instruction.)

- Alignment to the Rigor of the CCS
- Key Areas of Focus in the CCS
- Instructional Supports
- Assessment

RESOURCES

- EQuIP/Tri-State Quality Review Rubric for lessons and units
- Note: The rubric is included in the resources on the America Achieves site:
<http://commoncore.americaachieves.org/>
- Video: “I Hear the Wail of Millions” (Feaser) Grade 10: English
<http://commoncore.americaachieves.org/module/14> -

DIRECTIONS

1. View the video and review the written lesson plan included in this Participant Guide.
2. Read each of the four dimensions of the rubric. As a table, establish a consensus rating for each dimension that you feel able to rate.
3. Be prepared (as a table) to share out with the whole group an observation about the experience of using the rubric and/or the alignment of the lesson with the rubric.

ABOUT THIS LESSON

This is part of a six-week unit. It is the first lesson where students undertake a close reading of an informational text that is related to the major literary work being studied. In this lesson students determine the purpose and the structure of argument in Frederick Douglass’s “I hear the mournful wail of millions.” There is an emphasis on analyzing the language choices and citing evidence from the text. The culminating task for the unit is for students to write a brief essay that answers the following prompt: “How does Frederick Douglass introduce and then develop his position that America has nothing to

celebrate about itself on July 4, 1852? Explain Douglass’s position from beginning to end using evidence from the text to support your commentary.”

LESSON: “I HEAR THE MOURNFUL WAIL OF MILLIONS”

Grade	10	Subject	English Language Arts
Unit name	Connecting Informational Text with Literary Text	Lesson	Frederick Douglass’s “I Hear the Mournful Wail of Millions” speech
Lesson #	2	Teacher	Charles Feeser

CC Standards for English Language Arts	<p><u>RI.9-10.1</u> Cite strong and thorough evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.</p> <p><u>RI.9-10.6</u> Determine an author’s point of view or purpose and analyze how an author uses rhetoric to advance that point of view or purpose.</p>
---	--

LESSON PLAN:

SECTION	TIME	SHIFT	DETAIL
Review	10 minutes	Writing grounded in text	Paired students will share constructed responses from homework. Students will volunteer to read their general impressions to class.
Shared Reading / Close Reading	20 minutes	Content-rich nonfiction <u>Complex text</u>	<p>Teacher guides students through a close reading of the text, paragraph by paragraph.</p> <p>Teacher reads paragraph 1 aloud as students follow the text. Central Question for paragraph is posted: Why can’t Douglass celebrate American independence?</p> <p>1. What does Douglass imply in his opening address, “Fellow citizens”? What is ironic about this language?</p>

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. To which of our five senses does Douglass appeal in the opening lines? With that sense in mind, what does the word <u>tumultuous</u> mean in context? 3. What would be “scandalous and shocking” to Douglass? 4. What does Douglass mean by the expression “popular theme”? 5. <u>Reproach</u> is used here as a noun. Is it a favorable word? Why does Douglass refer to himself as a “reproach”? 6. Douglass makes a direct allusion to Psalm 137. An interesting extended assignment would be to have a student search the Internet for the text of Psalm 137 to share with the class, and then explain the allusion.
Sharing Answers	5 minutes	Writing grounded in text	Students will volunteer to share their paraphrases of paragraph 1.
Shared reading / Close reading	20 minutes	<p>Content-rich nonfiction</p> <p>Academic vocabulary</p>	<p>In pairs, have students write a brief paraphrase of paragraph 1. Students will volunteer to read paraphrases aloud. What should a good paraphrase accomplish?</p> <p>Teacher reads paragraph 2 aloud as students follow the text. Central Question for this paragraph is posted: How does Douglass change his tone in this paragraph? With whom does Douglass identify?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who is the “American bondman”? How does this expression connect to the topic sentence of this paragraph? 2. What does Douglass mean by the word <u>conduct</u>? How does he make this term negative? 3. What does the word <u>fettered</u> mean? Why is liberty fettered? What figure of speech is Douglass using here? How does this expression connect to his phrase, “the crushed and bleeding slave”? 4. Douglass uses the word <u>will</u> several times in this paragraph. What is the inference we can make when

		Complex text	<p>we hear that one uses his “will”? What does he state he will do? What does he state that he will not do?</p> <p>5. Who does Douglass say will agree with him by the close of this paragraph?</p> <p>6. Douglass makes another direct allusion, this time to a speech delivered by William Lloyd Garrison. An interesting extended assignment would be to have a student search the Internet for the text of the speech to share with the class.</p>
Sharing Answers	5 minutes	Writing grounded in the text	Students will volunteer to share their paraphrases of paragraph 1.
Discussion and close	5 minutes		Close class by having students record the Central Question for paragraph 3: How does Douglass support the claim that slaves are human beings and not beasts? Why does he make the claim that a persuasive argument to convince the “public mind” is pointless?

References

- ACT. (2006). Reading between the lines: What the ACT reveals about college readiness in reading. Available from http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/reading_summary.pdf
- Alberti, S. (December 2012/January 2013). Making the shifts. *Educational Leadership*, 70(4), 24-27.
- Aspen Institute. Education & Society Program (2012). *Tools for teachers: Implementing key shifts in the Common Core State Standards*.
- Anthology Alignment Project (2012). Available from <http://www.achievethecore.org/>. See also <http://www.edmodo.com/>.
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G. & Kucan, L. (2013). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction*. 2nd Edition. NY: Guilford Press.
- Blackburn, B. R. (2014). *Five Myths about Rigor and the Common Core*, by Little Switzerland, NC: MiddleWeb.com. Copyright 2014 by Barbara R. Blackburn. Reprinted with permission. Retrieved from <http://www.middleweb.com/12318/five-myths-rigor-common-core/> (website link: barbarablackburnonline.com)
- Brown, S., & Kappes, L (2012). *Implementing the Common Core State Standards: A primer on close reading of text*. Available from <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/tools-teachers-implementing-key-shifts-common-core-state-standards//>
- Cappiello, M. A., & Dawes, E. T. (2013). *Teaching with text sets*. Huntington Beach, CA: Shell Education.
- CCSSO & NGA. (2010). Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects. Washington, DC. Author, p. 5. Available from <http://www.corestandards.org/>
- Common Core shifts: a 2-page summary. Available from <http://www.achievethecore.org/>
- Complete College America (2011). Time is the enemy. Available from http://www.completecollege.org/docs/Time_is_the_Enemy.pdf
- Dounay Zinth, J., & Christie, K. (2012, January). *12 for 2012: Issues to move education forward in 2012*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2012). *Text complexity: Raising rigor in reading*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Gates Foundation (2012). Strategy scorecard: 2012 College ready strategy review. Bellevue, WA: Gates Foundation.

- Guide to Creating Questions for Close Analytic Reading. Available from <http://www.achievethecore.org/steal-these-tools/text-dependent-questions/>.
- Hiebert, E. H. (2012). Unique Words Require Unique Instruction. Available from <http://www.textproject.org/text-matters/>.
- http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading_2011/summary.asp
- http://parccmdfelaliteracyAugust2012_Final.pdf.
- <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/implementing-common-core-state-standards-primer-close-reading-text/>.
- Introduction to the ELA/Literacy Shifts. Available from <http://www.achievethecore.org/steal-these-tools/professional-development-modules/introduction-to-the-ela-literacy-shifts>
- Kamil, M. L., Borma, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., & Torgesen, J. (2008). *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices: A Practice Guide (NCEE#2008-027)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of education. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>
- Liebling, C., & Meltzer, J. (2011). Making a difference in student achievement using the Common Core State Standards for English language arts: What school and district leaders need to know. *A PCG Education White Paper*. Portsmouth, NH: Public Consulting Group.
- Loveless, T. (2011, February). How well are American students learning? *The 2010 Brown Center report on American Education*, 11(3). Washington, DC: Brown Center on Education Policy at Brookings.
- Model Content Frameworks – ELA/Literacy. <http://www.parcconline.org/mcf/ela/parcc-model-content-frameworks-browser>
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., & Drucker, K. T. (2012). *PIRLS 2011 International Results in Reading*. Chestnut Hill, MA: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston, College. Available from <http://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2011/international-results-pirls.html>.
- Nagy, W., & Townsend, D. (2012). Words as tools: Learning Academic Vocabulary as Language Acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(1), 91-108.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (2011). The Nation's Report Card. http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading_2011/
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers (2012). Supplemental information for Appendix A of the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy: New research on text complexity. Retrieved from <http://achievethecore.org/steal-these-tools/>

- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers (2010). *Common Core State Standard for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects*. Washington, D.C.: Authors. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/>; National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers (2012). See Appendix B: Text Exemplars and Sample Performance Tasks. http://www.corestandards.org/assets/Appendix_B.pdf
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers (2010). *Common Core State Standard for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects*. Washington, D.C.: Authors. See also Appendices A, B, and C. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/>
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers (2012). Supplemental information for Appendix A of the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy: New research on text complexity. Retrieved from <http://achievethecore.org/steal-these-tools/>
- OECD. (2010). PISA 2009 results: Executive Summary. Available from <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/pisa2009/>.
- Orter, W., Riley, R., Towne, L., Hightower, A.M., Lloyd, S.C., et al. (2012, January). *Preparing for change: A national perspective on Common Core State Standards implementation planning*. Seattle, WA: Education First and Bethesda, MD: Editorial Projects in Education, Inc.
- Shanahan, T. (December, 2012/January, 2013). The Common Core ate my baby and other urban legends. *Educational Leadership*, 70(4), pp.10-16. Available from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/dec12/vol70/num04/The-Common-Core-Ate-My-Baby-And-Other-Urban-Legends.aspx>.
- Student Achievement Partners. Available from www.achievethecore.org/downloads/EO702_Description_of_the_Common_Core_Shifts.pdf.
- Student Achievement Partners. See professional development modules on the instructional shifts. Retrieved from <http://achievethecore.org/steal-these-tools/professional-development-modules/introduction-to-the-ela-literacy-shifts?>

Videos

- “Declaration of Independence”, History/Social Studies, grade 8:
<http://commoncore.americaachieves.org/module/5>
- “I Hear the Wail of Millions” (Feaser), Grade 10: English:
<http://commoncore.americaachieves.org/module/14>

Websites for Quantitative Text Analyzers

ATOS Analyzer – Renaissance Learning. Available from <http://www.renlearn.com/ar/overview/atos/>

Degrees of Reading Power – Questar. Available from <http://www.questarai.com>

Lexile Framework – MetaMetrix. Available from <http://www.lexile.com/analyzer/>

Coh-Metrix Easability Tool. Available from <http://141.225.42.101/cohmetrixgates/Hoes.aspx?Login=1>

Nelson, J., Perfetti, C., Liben, D., & Liben, M. (2012). Measures of text difficulty: Testing their predictive value for grade levels and student performance. Report Submitted to the Gates Foundation. Available from <http://achievethecore.org/text-complexity> for this paper and more information about text complexity.

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><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></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><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></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><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></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><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></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>

EQIP 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.