

# EQuIP Review Feedback



**Lesson/Unit Name:** Jackrabbit

**Content Area:** English/language arts in grades K-2

**Grade Level:** K

**Overall Rating:**

**E/I**

Exemplar if Improved

## 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"><li>✓ Targets a set of K-2 ELA/Literacy CCSS for teaching and learning.</li><li>✓ Includes a clear and explicit purpose for instruction.</li><li>✓ 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.</li><li>✓ Provides opportunities for students to present ideas and information through writing and/or drawing and speaking experiences.</li></ul> <p><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Emphasize the explicit, systematic development of foundational literacy skills (concepts of print, phonological awareness, the alphabetic principle, high frequency sight words, and phonics).</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> 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).</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Integrate reading, writing, speaking and listening so that students apply and synthesize advancing literacy skills.</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</li></ul>	<p>Targets a set of K-2 ELA/Literacy CCSS for teaching and learning:</p> <p>The lesson identifies 12 standards from the strands of Reading Literature, Writing, Speaking and Listening, and Language as well as Next Generation Science Standards. Alignment is evident for many of the targeted standards. RL.K.1 is targeted during the close reading and the text dependent questions (TDQs) as are RL.K.3, RL.K.7, RL.K.10 and SL.K.2. The culminating task also clearly targets the stated writing standards W.K.2 and W.K.8.</p> <p>However, there are some instances that alignment is not evident. The opportunity to retell the story (RL.K.2) is not evident in the lesson and the teacher-led TDQs do not explicitly target "collaborative conversations with diverse partners" that follow agreed-upon rules(SL.K.1). Although the final task of writing a sentence suggests L.K.1, there is no evidence that it is being taught. The writing task addresses the L.K.2 component of capitalizing the first word in the sentence, but it is not included in the list of standards. Vocabulary is also a focus for the lesson with an addendum of definitions and Tier II and III words and through the questions being asked during the second reading, thus addressing RL.K.4, but it is not included the list of standards.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Clearly identify those standards that will be specifically addressed for each "reading" of the poem, quoting the actual standard with the number to be apparent to the teacher. Also consider establishing discussion rules prior to the second reading, instruction for L.K.1 and L.K.2, and adding L.K.2 and RL.K.4 to the standards taught.</p> <p>Includes a clear and explicit purpose for instruction:</p> <p>The purpose of the lesson, to determine a central idea, identify and summarize key details and to compare two texts to support a main topic, is clearly stated on page 1 and restated in the teacher directions. The lesson also provides instruction and expected student outcomes specific to the purpose within the lesson sequence. For example, the expected outcome for the initial reading is to "enjoy the poem, both text and pictures that accompany the text and experience it as a whole." Comparing the two texts is the purpose of Day 3 with a chart listing characteristics of both texts. Key details from each text are included in the chart, but comparison of the texts is not evident. Guidance in the teacher directions for specific questioning or strategies for drawing conclusions about the comparison would enhance the lesson.</p> <p>Selects quality texts that align with the requirements outlined in the standards, presents characteristics similar to CCSS K-2 exemplars and are of sufficient scope for the stated purpose:</p> <p>An explanation of the text complexity with evidences that the text is at the appropriate level of complexity for a kindergarten read aloud (Lexile in the</p>
--	---

	<p>upper band of grades 2-3) is included as an addendum to the lesson entitled, “What Makes this Text Complex?” The questions that are given in the lesson to analyze and draw inferences from the concepts presented in the text are further evidence of the complexity of the text.</p> <p>Provides opportunities for students to present ideas and information through writing and/or drawing and speaking experiences: Students are given opportunities to present ideas and information from the texts through writing, drawing, and speaking. On Days 1 and 2, students are answering TDQs allowing an opportunity for text related conversations. An outline or suggested procedures for this discussion would ensure that the speaking standards are sufficiently targeted. On Days 3 and 4, students are writing describing sentences and illustrating their sentences, which is an appropriate grade-level task.</p> <p>A longer unit or lesson:</p> <p>Though this is not a longer unit, it is noted that as the second part of a paired reading, this lesson helps to build a coherent body of knowledge in the area of science. Students are learning about the “physical traits and characteristics of organisms that support survival in an independent ecosystem” through a series of guided questions in the read aloud and the development of the comparison chart.</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"> <li>✓ <b>Reading Text Closely:</b> 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.</li> <li>✓ <b>Text-Based Evidence:</b> 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).</li> <li>✓ <b>Academic Vocabulary:</b> Focuses on explicitly building students’ academic vocabulary and concepts of syntax throughout instruction.</li> </ul> <p><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Grade-Level Reading:</b> 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.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Balance of Texts:</b> 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>).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Reading Text Closely</b></p> <p>It is evident that this text is the center of each instructional part or “reading” of the lesson. The second reading is specifically a Close Read Aloud. Text-based questions and sample responses are provided in the teacher directions. With the teacher’s guidance, the students have multiple opportunities to answer text-dependent questions about each chunk of the text. The questioning is appropriate for finding key details, but also goes beyond key details to include questions that engage the student with the text in more depth, such as, “How are hearing these sounds important?” and “How do the words, phrases, and blank lines change the way the reader reads the text?”</p> <p>It is not apparent through the directions that students are given the opportunity to ask their own questions about the text.</p> <p>Suggestion: In order to fully meet the criteria, include strategies in the teacher directions for student-led questioning with peers answering those questions, leading to class discussions.</p> <p><b>Text-based Evidence</b></p> <p>The questioning in the lesson and the culminating writing/drawing activity all require that the students use evidence from the text to answer questions, summarize details, and compare two texts. During the second read aloud, a series of guiding questions are used to engage students around central understandings of the poem. Questions, such as “What word does the author use to show jackrabbit is quick?” and “What does jackrabbit need to know?” direct students back to the text to search for the answer. The questions build from these concrete questions to more inferential questions, such as “Why does the jackrabbit need to know</p>
--	---

<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Balance of Writing:</b> Include prominent and varied writing opportunities for students that balance communicating thinking and answering questions with self-expression and exploration.</p>	<p>these things?" The development of the chart on Day 3 also requires students to draw specific evidence from both this lesson's text and the paired text. Text-based writing is evident during the culminating task. The lesson is unclear about procedures to ensure the level of student involvement during the chart development. Is every student adding to the chart?</p> <p>Suggestion: Consider adding specific strategies during the chart development to ensure that every student is using the text as evidence for details. Also consider adding strategies for some text-based writing and drawing opportunities on Days 1 and 2 leading to the culminating task.</p> <p><b>Academic Vocabulary</b></p> <p>Vocabulary development is specifically addressed with TDQs during the second reading. There are also academic words used by the teacher during the questioning, such as "author," "phrases," "poem," and "physical characteristics," which set an expectation of the knowledge of academic vocabulary. The developers have also included a separate vocabulary attachment to the lesson specifying vocabulary meriting more time, along with definitions and page numbers.</p> <p><b>Longer unit or lesson</b></p> <p>Though the lesson is focused around a single text, balance of texts is addressed in this lesson since it is the second part of a paired reading consisting of a poem and an informational text.</p>
--	---

Rating: 2 – Meets many 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"> <li>✓ Cultivates student interest and engagement in reading, writing and speaking about texts.</li> <li>✓ 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).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Integrates targeted instruction in multiple areas such as grammar and syntax, writing strategies, discussion rules and aspects of foundational reading.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Provides substantial materials to support students who need more time and attention to achieve automaticity with decoding, phonemic awareness, fluency and/or vocabulary acquisition.</li> <li>✓ 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Cultivates interests and motivation in engaging reading, writing, speaking about texts:</p> <p>The lesson engages student interest with a high-quality, complex text. Active learning tasks, such as acting out some of the vocabulary and drawing and helping to create the chart are motivational instructional strategies that allow students to actively construct meaning and build content area knowledge.</p> <p>Addresses instructional expectations and easy for teachers to use and understand:</p> <p>The instructional expectations are clear and the format of the lesson is very easy for any teacher to pick up and use. The left-hand side of the plan shows what the teacher should do and the right-hand side lists student outcomes. Text-dependent questions with sample responses are provided as well as suggestions for the teacher, such as "clarify freeze." Background information is provided for the teacher as well as vocabulary and text complexity information.</p> <p>Integrates targeted instruction in syntax, writing strategies, discussion rules, and aspects of foundational reading:</p> <p>Although the Day 2 lesson includes class discussion and Day 4 culminates in a writing task, there is no evidence in the lesson of instruction in syntax, writing strategies, discussion rules, nor foundational reading other than modeling through a read aloud.</p> <p>Suggestion: Include strategies for setting discussion rules for Day 2 and syntax and writing instruction in Days 1, 2, and 3 to lead up to the</p>
---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Integrates appropriate, extensive and easily implemented supports for students who are ELL, have disabilities and/or read or write below grade level.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Provides extensions and/or more advanced text for students who read or write above grade level.</li> </ul> <p><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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>).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Gradually remove supports, allowing students to demonstrate their independent capacities (<i>may be more applicable across the year or several units</i>).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Provide for authentic learning, application of literacy skills and/or student-directed inquiry.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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>).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Use technology and media to deepen learning and draw attention to evidence and texts as appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p>expectation on Day 4 that students will write a sentence with a capital letter and end punctuation.</p> <p>Provides substantial materials to achieve automaticity in phonics, fluency, and vocabulary: Materials for automaticity in phonics are not appropriate for the lesson since it is a read aloud. There is some support for fluency in that the text is re-read and the teacher is modeling fluency for reading a poem. There are no supports included in the lesson for those students who are struggling with the vocabulary concepts in the lesson.</p> <p>Provides all students opportunities to engage with grade level texts and read alouds at high levels of complexity with scaffolding: Since this lesson is a read-aloud activity, all students have access to the central text at a high level of complexity. Students engage with the text through acting out vocabulary, answering questions, and writing/drawing about the text.</p> <p>Suggestion: To meet the criteria of providing “extensive” opportunities to engage in the text, consider adding strategies such as paired discussion and possible journaling activities.</p> <p>Focuses on sections of rich texts that present challenge, provides discussion questions, to move toward independence: There are several opportunities for students to work with challenging sections of this text. The lesson sequence during the second reading breaks the text into chunks that are then discussed as a class through high quality questioning.</p> <p>Integrates appropriate supports for ELLs, SWDs, struggling readers: The lesson does not provide specific supports or scaffolding for ELL students, those with disabilities, students who are below grade level or for any student who is struggling to grasp the science concepts, the vocabulary, compare texts, or write a sentence with an illustration.</p> <p>Suggestion: Include supports for students who struggle with the lesson and the tasks involved, such as answer partners for the class discussions, cooperative learning for the chart completion, re-teaching strategies for the concepts, and sentence dictation, cutting out illustrations, etc. for those students who struggle with writing a sentence and drawing a picture.</p> <p>Provides extensions and/or advanced texts for advanced learners: A fun extension activity is listed at the end of the lesson, but there are no extensions or activities specifically for advanced learners. It is noted, however, in the lesson script that lines 11-14 provide an opportunity to discuss “learned behavior v. instinctual” and suggests that the teacher has the autonomy to address the concept.</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"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elicits direct, observable evidence of the degree to which a student can independently demonstrate foundational skills and targeted</li> </ul>	<p>Elicits direct, observable evidence of the degree to which a student can independently demonstrate foundational skills and targeted grade level literacy: The class discussion for the TDQs and the chart development offer an opportunity to guide and observe students’ understanding of the text and performance on the targeted reading standards. The “Expected Outcome</p>
---	---

<p>grade level literacy CCSS (e.g., reading, writing, speaking and listening and/or language).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Assesses student proficiency using methods that are unbiased and accessible to all students.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</li> </ul> <p><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Use varied modes of assessment, including a range of pre-, formative, summative and self-assessment measures.</li> </ul>	<p>or Response" section states expectations for student responses which teachers can observe during the second reading. The lesson does not suggest a framework for observing evidence of independent proficiency, and the evidence is dependent on how well students are listening and engaged. The writing task on Day 4 is observable evidence that students can write a sentence stating a key detail about how living things survive where they live.</p> <p>Suggestion: Add structure to the second reading and Day 3 chart development, such as paired and group discussions, to ensure that every child participates in the discussion. Consider providing specific formative assessment opportunities throughout the lesson.</p> <p>Methods unbiased and accessible to all students: The assessment task on Day 4 of the lesson is appropriate for on-grade level second semester kindergartners. However, it is unclear how struggling writers will be given support in order to show that they have learned the science concepts or how advanced learners might be challenged to show the depth of their learning.</p> <p>Suggestion: Consider additional methods for completing the Day 4 assessment task so that all students can demonstrate their learning.</p> <p>Aligned rubrics or guidelines for sufficient guidance for interpreting student performance and responding to deficits: There is guidance for expectations of student performance through sample responses to the questions during the second reading and samples of student work for the Day 4 activity so that the discussion and writing task give some formative assessment information. However, there is little guidance for looking for evidence that will determine mastery of the targeted standards or for addressing deficits. How will the Speaking and Listening and Writing standards be assessed for individual students?</p> <p>Suggestion: Since there is such a difference in the mastery expectations from the beginning of kindergarten to the end of kindergarten, information on what level of performance is expected in relation to the time of the kindergarten year would be helpful. A rubric for evaluating the sentence structure and the science concepts reflected in the sentence/illustration would take this from only a formative task to more of an assessment of mastery.</p>
---	---

Rating: 1 – Meets some of the criteria in the dimension

### Summary Comments

The Jackrabbit lesson is an excellent lesson for exposing kindergartners to a rich text that teaches a science concept. The developer has a clear purpose for instruction, and the students' science content knowledge will be developed. The TDQs are of high quality and are central to the text, as are the opportunities for students to engage with the text through the development of a chart and the final writing/drawing task. The organization of the lesson, the pacing, and the content all contribute to making this plan ready to teach.

The lesson, however, seems to be designed for students who are all performing at the same level. There are few supports for students who are performing below grade level or above grade level. The lesson would be enhanced by adding probing questions to support those students who are struggling to understand the concepts and the vocabulary, diverse opportunities to engage in text-related conversations in addition to the whole group discussions, more writing opportunities and instruction leading up to the Day 4 writing task, supports for ELL and students with disabilities, and extension activities for advanced learners.

The lesson would also be improved by a more comprehensive assessment component, including more formative and summative assessment opportunities with rubrics.

#### ***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.