

Activity 5

Connecticut Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy



Grades K–5

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: Grade 5, English language Arts “Graphic nonfiction: Harriet Tubman” (Sims).
<http://commoncore.americaachieves.org/module/2> (Segment 1:30 – 8:30) approximately 7 minutes
- Lesson plan for Harriet Tubman, The Life of an African-American Abolitionist

DIRECTIONS

1. View the video and review the written lesson plan (on the following pages of the 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.

LESSON: HARRIET TUBMAN, THE LIFE OF AN AFRICAN-AMERICAN ABOLITIONIST

Grade	5	Subject	English Language Arts
Unit name	Slavery and Segregation	Lesson	Harriet Tubman, The Life of an African-American Abolitionist
Lesson #	3	Teacher	Monica Sims
CCS Standards for English Language Arts	<p><u>Reading Standards</u></p> <p>RI.5.1 Quote accurately from a text when explaining what the text says explicitly and when drawing inferences from the text.</p> <p>RI.5.3 Explain the relationships or interactions between two or more individuals, events, ideas, or concepts based on specific information in the text.</p> <p>RI.5.4 Determine the meaning of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases in a text relevant to a grade 5 topic or subject area.</p> <p><u>Writing Standards</u></p> <p>W.5.9.b Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</p> <p><u>Speaking and Listening Standards</u></p> <p>SL.5.1 Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussion, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly.</p>		

UNIT OVERVIEW

Day One	Formal assessment on the book <i>Mississippi Trial 1955</i> . Reading: nonfiction article that provides the confession from Roy Bryant and J.W. Milam about the murder and death of Emmett Till.
Day Two	Examine specific quotes from the text and draw conclusions about the expressions and the point of view of Emmett Till, J.W. Milam and Roy Bryant.
Day Three	Graphic text study: <i>Harriet Tubman, The Life of an African-American Abolitionist</i>

Day Four	<p>Socratic Seminar – through Socratic Seminar, students will practice building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly.</p> <p>Informal assessment and feedback on questions asked throughout the text during the week.</p>
Day Five	Formal assessment

LESSON PLAN: HARRIET TUBMAN, THE LIFE OF AN AFRICAN-AMERICAN ABOLITIONIST

SECTION	TIME	SHIFT	DETAIL
Review	3 minutes	Text selection Academic vocabulary	<p>Recap the unit on Emmett Till and address questions students asked about the origin of segregation and racism.</p> <p>Have students think about the earlier time period as they prepare to read the text.</p> <p>Review the objective of the lesson which is to have students quote accurately from a text when explaining what the text says explicitly and when drawing inferences from the text.</p> <p>Discuss and explain complex vocabulary Peculiar – strange Institution – any established law or custom</p>
Reading the text/independent reading	10 minutes	Text selection	Read aloud to students who need additional support to give them access to the text
Introduction to activity	2 minutes		Distribute the questions that accompany the text for students to review as we begin a shared reading of the text.

Shared reading of text	10 minutes	Vocabulary	Shared reading – students read aloud with teacher support where needed.
Gathering evidence	15 minutes	Evidence from text	Students discuss the questions in table groups and answer the questions independently on a sheet of paper.
Sharing answers and questions	8 minutes	Evidence from text Vocabulary	Students share out their answers citing text support.
Discussion and close	2 minutes		After the reading, students will write down something that stood out to them in their reading. Pull named popsicle sticks to have 5–7 students share their written thoughts.

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 K-2 ELA/Literacy CCSS for teaching and learning. ○ Includes a clear and explicit purpose for instruction. ○ Selects quality text(s) that align with the requirements outlined in the standards, presents characteristics similar to CCSS K-2 exemplars (Appendix B), and are of sufficient scope for the stated purpose. ○ Provides opportunities for students to present ideas and information through writing and/or drawing and speaking experiences. <p><u><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Emphasize the explicit, systematic development of foundational literacy skills (concepts of print, phonological awareness, the alphabetic principle, high frequency sight words, and phonics). ○ Regularly include specific fluency-building techniques supported by research (e.g., monitored partner reading, choral reading, repeated readings with text, following along in the text when teacher or other fluent reader is reading aloud, short timed practice that is slightly challenging to the reader). ○ Integrate reading, writing, speaking and listening so that students apply and synthesize advancing literacy skills. ○ Build students' content knowledge in social studies, the arts, science or technical subjects through a coherent sequence of texts and series of questions that build knowledge within a topic. 	<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 (including read alouds) a central focus of instruction and includes regular opportunities for students to ask and answer text-dependent questions. ○ Text-Based Evidence: Facilitates rich text-based discussions and writing through specific, thought-provoking questions about common texts (including read alouds and, when applicable, illustrations, audio/video and other media). ○ Academic Vocabulary: Focuses on explicitly building students' academic vocabulary and concepts of syntax throughout instruction. <p><u><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grade-Level Reading: Include a progression of texts as students learn to read (e.g., additional phonic patterns are introduced, increasing sentence length). Provides text-centered learning that is sequenced, scaffolded and supported to advance students toward independent grade-level reading. ○ Balance of Texts: Focus instruction equally on literary and informational texts as stipulated in the CCSS (p.5) and indicated by instructional time (<i>may be more applicable across a year or several units</i>). ○ Balance of Writing: Include prominent and varied writing opportunities for students that balance communicating thinking and answering questions with self-expression and exploration. 	<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 for teachers (e.g., clear directions, sample proficient student responses, sections that build teacher understanding of the whys and how of the material). ○ Integrates targeted instruction in multiple areas such as grammar and syntax, writing strategies, discussion rules and aspects of foundational reading. ○ Provides substantial materials to support students who need more time and attention to achieve automaticity with decoding, phonemic awareness, fluency and/or vocabulary acquisition. ○ Provides <i>all</i> students (including emergent and beginning readers) with extensive opportunities to engage with grade-level texts and read alouds that are at high levels of complexity including appropriate scaffolding so that students directly experience the complexity of text. ○ Focuses on sections of rich text(s) (including read alouds) that present the greatest challenge; provides discussion questions and other supports to promote student engagement, understanding and progress toward independence. ○ Integrates appropriate, extensive and easily implemented supports for students who are ELL, have disabilities and/or read or write below grade level. ○ Provides extensions and/or more advanced text for students who read or write above grade level. <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, knowledge and skills advance and deepen over time (<i>may be more applicable across the year or several units</i>). ○ Gradually remove supports, allowing 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 and/or student-directed inquiry. ○ Indicate how students are accountable for independent engaged 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 developing standards-based skills:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elicits direct, observable evidence of the degree to which a student can independently demonstrate foundational skills and targeted grade level literacy CCSS (e.g., reading, writing, speaking and listening and/or language). ○ 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 and responding to areas where students are not yet meeting standards. <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>

The EquiP rubric is derived from the Tri-State Rubric and the collaborative development process led by Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island and facilitated by Achieve.

This version of the EquiP rubric is current as of 06-24-13.

View Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>. Educators may use or adapt. If modified, please attribute EquiP and re-title.

EQIP Rubric for Lessons & Units: ELA/Literacy Grades K-2

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 or 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.

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>

EQuIP 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.

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.
- America Achieves (2012). EQiLP Resources. Retrieved from <http://commoncore.americaachieves.org/>
- Aspen Institute. Education & Society Program (2012). *Tools for teachers: Implementing key shifts in the Common Core State Standards*.
- 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 as 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

“Mars - Supporting Evidence” (Price), <http://commoncore.americaachieves.org/module/20>

“The Wonders of Nature” (Liben), <http://commoncore.americaachieves.org/module/6>

“Graphic Non-Fiction: Harriet Tubman” (Sims), <http://commoncore.americaachieves.org/module/2>

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.