

EQuIP Review Feedback



Lesson/Unit Name: Cold War- CAS Spring Unit 2015

Content Area: English language arts

Grade Level: 11

Overall Rating:

E

Exemplar

Dimension I – Alignment to the Depth of the CCSS

<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><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></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>Summary of Observations: This unit targets a set of grade-level CCSS ELA/Literacy standards. The lessons seem to have multiple purposes for instruction throughout the mini-tasks, etc. The only texts students read were the political cartoons and transcripts. For the purpose of this unit, these were of sufficient quality and scope; however, they were not within the grade-level text complexity band.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement: The only confusion with the standards is that it varied between Kentucky and Colorado. The reviewers assume this was an intentional collaboration on LDC website and that explains the standards listed. Whole group presentations are needed to integrate speaking standards for all units. The structure of the lesson could be simplified with an overall lesson plan that includes all documents hyperlinked, etc.</p> <p>Targets a set of grade-level: Common Core H/SS Reading Skill 1 (using textual evidence to support accurate analysis); Common Core H/SS reading Skill 9 (integrating information from diverse sources, noting discrepancies); Common Core H/SS Writing Skill 1. (writing discipline-specific arguments) Assignments ask for textual evidence.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: none</p> <p>Clear & explicit purpose: The Desired Outcome is clear and specific, but the subsequent lesson plans in mini lessons muddled and confused the reviewer at first.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: Consider how pieces connect and relate to the overall purpose and make it consistent.</p> <p>Tests within grade level: The texts are appropriate to the purpose of the scope and sequence of the unit and the mini-lessons individually despite perhaps not being high lexile level</p> <p>Areas for improvement: none</p> <p>Integrates reading, writing, speaking & listening: Each of the mini lessons include opportunities for students to read, write, speak & listen. The seminar with the final mini lesson is great.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: none</p>
---	---

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

Dimension II – Key Shifts the CCSS

<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><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></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>Students are not expected to examine the test closely by discerning a deep meaning other than in the political cartoons. Close reading occurs in the LDC articles where students are asked to read and annotate. Students participate in one student led discussion. The end result of the lesson is an argumentative paper. Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary are domain specific, meaning they should stay in Tier 3. There is no instruction with the Academic Vocabulary.</p> <p>There does not seem to be an increase in text complexity; however, for the purpose of this lesson it is not needed. A literary text is not warranted for this unit.</p> <p>The greatest strength of this unit is building disciplinary knowledge.</p> <p>Students are asked repeatedly to write in each task. There is nothing mentioned about revision for the final essay.</p>
Rating: 3 – Meets most to all of the criteria in the dimension	

Dimension III – Instructional Supports

<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. 	<p>Cultivates student interest: All students can become interested in the topic, especially with the Walt Disney connection. The Dot Activity immediately engages students to help them comprehend what it was like.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: none</p>
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focuses on challenging sections of text(s) and engages students in a productive struggle through discussion questions and other supports that build toward independence. <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> 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"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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>). <input type="checkbox"/> Gradually remove supports, requiring students to demonstrate their independent capacities (<i>may be more applicable across the year or several units</i>). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provide for authentic learning, application of literacy skills, student-directed inquiry, analysis, evaluation and/or reflection. <input type="checkbox"/> Integrate targeted instruction in such areas as grammar and conventions, writing strategies, discussion rules and all aspects of foundational reading for grades 3-5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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>). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use technology and media to deepen learning and draw attention to evidence and texts as appropriate. 	<p>Addresses instructional expectations: Unit is difficult & cumbersome to use as presented. Peer reviewer found it difficult to navigate and string each activity to the next.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: Consider the possibility of creating one overall unit plan with links to the various parts & pieces for easier use and navigation. A first year teacher will appreciate the depth and breadth of documents created but hyperlinking them into one template for ease of use would be helpful.</p> <p>Provides all students: Scaffolding for lower level students is not observed unless heterogeneous grouping is used in the group activities.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: Consider outlining specific ways & scaffolds that can be used to help all students access the documents, texts, lesson ideas, etc.</p> <p>Focuses on challenging sections: For the purpose and scope of the unit, this indicator is not necessary. Engaging students can be achieved through the first and third mini lesson seminars.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: None.</p> <p>Integrates appropriate supports: Activities are lower level and ELL may be fine with the lesson - especially the cartoons; however, when approaching the UDL articles, language becomes technical and ELL could use some assistance. No scaffolds for writing or speaking are indicated for ELLs.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: Consider including scaffolds to help ELLs approach & work with the multiple texts.</p> <p>Provides extensions: Not observed.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: Consider building extensions into the unit to challenge higher level students, especially one or more advanced texts.</p> <p>Includes a progression: The disciplinary knowledge deepens throughout the unit, especially as it relates to McCarthyism. The skills also progress in documents analyzed throughout the three mini lessons ultimately culminating with an argumentative essay.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: None.</p> <p>Gradually removes supports: No supports were found that needed to be removed; however, the natural progression of the mini lessons create independence among students as they build toward the argumentative essay.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: Consider scaffolds for lower level students.</p> <p>Provides for authentic learning: Literacy skills definitely noted in analysis of the political cartoons, inquiry, analysis and evaluation are also found in all of the mini lessons; reflection noted in the self-assessment for the discussion. All areas of this indicator are met exceedingly well.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: None.</p>
--	--

	<p>Integrates targeted instruction: Targeted instruction is found in writing strategies and discussion rules.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: None.</p> <p>Indicates how students are accountable: The unit does not include an overall independent reading assignment; however, through the mini lessons and activities, students' interest, stamina, confidence and motivation increase as they work toward mastery on the final assessment.</p> <p>Areas for improvement: None.</p> <p>Use technology: Political cartoons (media) and History Channel video (technology) help deepen students' learning and connect them to other texts in the unit</p> <p>Areas for improvement: None.</p>
--	--

Rating: **2 – Meets many of the criteria in the dimension**

Dimension IV – Assessment

<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><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Use varied modes of assessment, including a range of pre-, formative, summative and self-assessment measures. 	<p>The reviewers would like to know exactly what the pre-assessment is. We identified the formative assessments through mini-tasks along the way. The summative assessment is well identified and well thought out. The self-assessment measure is identified through the discussion piece.</p>
--	---

Rating: **3 – Meets most to all of the criteria in the dimension**

Summary Comments

Total Score: 11

The depth and breadth of planning is wonderful; however, stream-line the formatting so that other teachers can have ease of use and maneuverability. The topic is engaging for students and the variety of activities keeps students motivated and building toward the final assessment. The Dot Activity was a fabulous way of introducing to students what people felt like at the time when accused. With the few minor adjustments in terms of ELL, scaffolding, and extensions, the unit will be completely well-rounded for any and all classrooms who are more diverse.

Rating Scales

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

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**)

Rating Descriptors

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.

Descriptor for Overall Ratings:

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.