

EQulP Review Feedback



Lesson/Unit Name: Mother to Son
Content Area: English language arts
Grade Level: 5

<p>Overall Rating:</p> <p>E</p> <p>Exemplar</p>

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><u>A unit or longer lesson should:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Integrate reading, writing, speaking and listening so that students apply and synthesize advancing literacy skills.☐ (Grades 3-5) Build students' content knowledge and their understanding of reading and writing in social studies, the arts, science or technical subjects through the coherent selection of texts.	<p>-Targets a set of grade level CSS ELA/Literacy standards: This unit specifically targets and identifies two standards for instruction. This unit “will focus on RL5.2, determining the theme of a poem using details in the text, including how characters respond to challenges and how the narrator reflects upon a topic.” In addition, RL5.4 will be taught by reading informational text about metaphors and actively participating in the close reading of Langston Hughes’ poem Mother to Son, focusing on the use of metaphors in this poem.” These two standards are strategically taught in this unit.</p> <p>The unit also notes on page 6-7 the reading, writing, speaking/listening, and language standards that the developers feel students will practice during this unit. In addition the developers demonstrate the reading and writing connection by noting the key points of the standards into the teaching task from the Leading Design Collaborative (LDC). The context of time (mid-year), the connection to previous lessons (theme), and the next lesson (deeper theme and figurative language) is clearly noted in the unit’s description.</p> <p>Suggestion: The informative essay is covered over five of the eight days for this unit. Therefore it would seem that W5.2 should be identified as a main standard for the Teaching Task.</p> <p>-Clear and explicit purpose for instruction: This unit starts by stating that the intent of implementation of this unit is for mid-school year instruction. It also clarifies that “prior to this module, students will have had several instructional opportunities to learn about theme.” Scope and sequence is further clarified by explaining that “additional lessons will follow this module to allow students to continue to practice and deepen their understanding of theme and figurative language.”</p> <p>The developer identifies four purposes for this unit: Deepen the students’ ability to analyze meanings of metaphors in poetry. Develop a better understanding of how an author develops a theme through word choice. Allow students to demonstrate their learning through an informational essay. Address ELA grade level specific standards.</p> <p>The developer also suggests that students are to be reminded of the unit purpose and rubrics in setting the context/purpose of instruction on each day of the unit.</p> <p>-Appropriate grade-level text (complexity, quality, purpose): The developer provided the web sources for their analysis of the quality and complexity of the metaphors text and the Hughes’ poem. The developer highlights their consideration of qualitative and quantitative aspects of text complexity. They note that while the Lexile of the poem is lower the figurative language</p>
---	---

increases the complexity for fifth graders. The focus on themes and figurative language in the texts is aligned to the intent of the learning targets.

-Integrate reading, writing, speaking/listening so that students apply and synthesize advancing literacy skills: This unit clearly identifies activities related to standards in reading, writing and speaking/listening. The unit integrates reading of a poem and writing an informative essay to demonstrate student understanding of metaphors and theme.

There are language standards that are identified as “built in” or “when appropriate.” Appropriate use of language conventions is included in the writing rubric although they are not specifically delineated.

Speaking and listening is addressed during the writing process on the informative essay (SL5.1) and during the Socratic Seminar.

-Build students’ content knowledge: Because this is an extended lesson with a narrow scope based on two objectives, understanding theme and the use of metaphors in poetry, there is no opportunity for students to develop knowledge in content areas outside of English/Language Arts.

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

Dimension II – Key Shifts the CCSS

The lesson/unit addresses key shifts in the CCSS:

- ✓ **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.

A unit or longer lesson should:

- 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

-Reading text closely: Students engage in a close reading of Mother to Son during three separate reads. On day two the initial reading is done by students independently, circling any words/phrases that they do not comprehend. After the second reading students discuss the overall meaning of the poem. Text-dependent questions are discussed and answered by students after the third reading requiring them to cite textual evidence for their responses. On Day 3 the poem is chorally read during the fourth read and students work independently or in pairs to paraphrase each stanza to demonstrate their understanding of metaphors.

-Text-based evidence: During the close reading students are required to “support their conversations” with textual evidence (Day 2) and “return to the text for evidence for their responses” to the text-dependent questions (Day 2). On Day 4 students participate in the Socratic Seminar (Fishbowl) “citing text-based evidence”. On Days 6-7 students provide “text-based evidence” and “direct quote” for the informative essay. The discussion bridges the reading and writing process.

-Writing from sources: Students are expected to use evidence from the text in discussion and in essay writing. They write short responses for the text-dependent questions (Day 2), create “text-based notes” for the Socratic Seminar, (Day 4), “include supporting text-based evidence” for the Body paragraph (Day 6-7), and “direct quotes” in the Closing paragraph (Day7). The appendix provides student writing forms for days 1-5. The whole unit is designed around the LDC writing elementary writing task 9.

-Academic vocabulary: The main academic vocabulary word that is developed in this extended lesson is metaphor. Students demonstrate their understanding of metaphors by responding to text-dependent questions on Day 2 and paraphrasing each stanza on Day 3. Using precise language and specific vocabulary is listed in four of the 11 steps in section 2. Tier II words are listed for metaphors: comparison, ordinary, interpretation, ambition.

<p>coherent selection of strategically sequenced, discipline-specific texts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ 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>Hiroshima is listed as a Tier III word.</p> <p>The unit also states on day two the teacher should discuss vocabulary students identify.</p> <p>-Increasing text complexity: Because of the structure and purpose of this extended lesson, there are only two texts provided. One is a poem and the other is an informational piece. It is mentioned that students should have a wide variety of poems and poetry anthologies for self-selected reading times available to them. We have no indication how texts used in future lessons will ramp up from this 8-day unit or how the two texts fit in comparison to texts used earlier in the academic year. Because this is part of a larger unit of instruction, it is hoped that over time the level of text complexity will increase, as the poem is a Lexile level of 790L.</p> <p>-Building disciplinary knowledge: The developer mentions in the overview that additional lessons will follow to continue the practice and deepen student understanding of theme and figurative language. This unit does not address a progression of complex texts.</p> <p>-Balance of texts: This focused and purposeful unit uses one informational text (metaphors) and one literary text (poem).</p> <p>-Balance of writing: Writing for different purposes is integrated not only as a means to demonstrate learning, but as a way to process information in the unit. Students are asked to paraphrase, answer text-based questions in writing, and outline during the 8-day unit. The final writing piece goes through the writing process on days 4-8. Again, the scope of this extended lesson is narrow and purposeful. It is hoped that over time, students will have the opportunity to develop writing skills in other areas.</p>
<p>Rating: 3 – Meets most to all of the criteria in the dimension</p>	

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. ✓ 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>-Cultivates interest and engagement in reading, writing, speaking: Student engagement is cultivated through grouping students to read and discuss the metaphors in the poem through the use of text-dependent questions (Day 2), participate in a Fishbowl discussion (Day 4), and pair up to discuss metaphors from the poem that help develop the theme (Day 5) They also have the opportunity to deconstruct the Rubric on Day 1 by dividing into groups, deconstructing the assigned element of the rubric and creating a poster as a visual representation of the element. On Day 8, students are engaged in a Peer Review Checklist to give feedback to revise their essays.</p> <p>The selected poem would have emotional connections for students because of the mother/child bond. The developer goes to great lengths to make sure students understand the task before them on day 1 and continues to put that purpose in front of students. Providing students some kind of connection to their future would increase interest and engagement.</p> <p>Students do talk, listen, and read, and write throughout the eight days.</p> <p>-Addresses instructional expectations and easy to understand: The overview described the unit purpose, and highlighted key points in the unit. The unit is organized into easy to follow sections for the classroom teacher: overview, 1) what task, 2) what skills, 3) what instruction, 4) what results and appendices. The clear expectation is that students will be able to analyze</p>
---	--

A unit or longer lesson should:

- Include a progression of learning where concepts and skills advance and deepen over time (*may be more applicable across the year or several units*).
- ✓ Gradually remove supports, requiring students to demonstrate their independent capacities (*may be more applicable across the year or several units*).
- 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 (*may be more applicable across the year or several units*).
- Use technology and media to deepen learning and draw attention to evidence and texts as appropriate.

metaphors and how the author's choice of words contributes to theme. In addition section 1, what skills, describes not only how the lesson progresses from reading to writing, but notes the abilities students will use to move through the unit's selected task. Section 3 uses the skill progressions to align the instructional strategies and assessment.

-Provides all students opportunity to engage in text: The developer intended for this unit to be for all students. The task is articulated and ramped for success. Success criteria for each day are provided. With each rereading students take small steps in their learning about theme and metaphors. There is really only one text that students engage with multiple times.

- Focuses on challenging sections of text(s) and engages students in a productive struggle: Every stanza of Mother to Son and key words receive focus. Students initially review both texts independently. The challenging sections of this poem engage students in a productive struggle with the theme through text-dependent questions (Day 2) and the Fishbowl (Day 4).

-Integrates appropriate supports: Students are grouped and scaffolded to engage with complex texts. Examples for striving students are: "hear the poem read aloud" (Day 2); "carefully paired to encourage optimal engagement and comprehension" (Day 2); "read text-dependent questions" (Day 2); read to striving students, provide additional examples, sentence stems and small group support (Days 5-8).

-Provides extension: The developer provides four extension suggestions. The first one is analyzing metaphors in popular music and provides links to teacher-created video/PowerPoints which could be used for investigating the use of metaphors and similes in pop or current music. There were some extensions for advanced learners such as allowing them to write their own text dependent questions. They may write more paragraphs, or read other pieces of text. On page three there were also these suggestions for optional activities that are more rigorous and relevant. Students could rewrite the poem into a Reader's Theater version to dramatize the theme of the poem. Students would be encouraged to add dialogue between the mother and the son. They could then act out the new version.

If desired, students could use a story or video creator software to develop a play around the poem. Students could create the characters with animation and sound.

In addition, more advanced learners could use the Internet to research other poems with similar themes. A comparison/contrast could be made about how the different authors developed the same theme. A focus on author's word choice and the use of figurative language could be addressed.

-Includes progression of learning: Because this extended unit is only two weeks in length and has a specific scope and purpose, there is not the opportunity to meet these criteria. It could be assumed that the many of the skills used in this unit have been developed and are now being practiced. We also know that this unit is part of a broader scope of instruction.

-Gradually removes supports: The unit moves students through the reading process in small steps, followed by a transition to writing, and then through the writing process needed to fulfill the original task of the unit. Each of the 11 steps in the skill progression are outlined in column 5 in section 3 to move the students to independence. At the end of this unit, students are expected to have written an essay to show their understanding of the use of metaphor

	<p>in developing theme.</p> <p>-Provides for authentic learning: Peer evaluations are part of the writing process. Students write as much as they read in this lesson. Students are writing for the authentic purpose of explaining theme.</p> <p>-Integrates targeted instruction: Targeted instruction is provided for writing strategies, and discussion rules. Fluency is stressed on the second reading of the poem.</p> <p>The rubric reflects that 1/7th of the grade is based on conventions. There is not any targeted convention instruction, but rather a review in the editing on Day 8. It would be helpful to include some instructional strategies for the teacher in case the students need more instruction.</p> <p>-Indicates how students are accountable for independent reading: Although it states that, students should have available a wide variety of poems and poetry anthologies for self-selected reading times, these are not identified nor is it indicated in the instructional chronology. For the novice teacher, it would be helpful to indicate some titles that have strong use of metaphor and them.</p> <p>If independent reading is an expectation of this unit, a recording device and instructions on how to hold students accountable could be included to give the teacher guidance.</p> <p>-Uses technology and media: Technology and media is not integrated into the unit. Three on-line PowerPoint videos are part of the extensions.</p> <p>Students could analyze metaphors in popular music. If desired, students could use a story or video creator software to develop a play around the poem. Students could create the characters with animation and sound. Also, students could research on line other poems that have a strong theme. Another suggestion would be to use word processing for the informative essay.</p>
<p>Rating: 2 – Meets many of the criteria in the dimension</p>	

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><u><i>A unit or longer lesson should:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Use varied modes of assessment, including a range of pre-, formative, summative and self-assessment measures. 	<p>-Elicits observable evidence of students' independent demonstration of standards: For each step in the lesson plan expectations are provided in column 4. There are many opportunities to formatively assess students as “each mini-task includes the skill, skill definition, pacing, a mini-prompt and product, an outline of the instruction and scoring guidelines.” (cover sheet). Some examples of the evidence that students are meeting the standards include: Actively participates in partner, small group and whole group conversations (Days 2-4); Uses textual evidence in their comment or responses (Days 2); descriptors for demonstrating active reading behaviors (Days 2 &3); Use notes, peer suggestions and self-reflection to engage fully in the conversation (Day 4).</p> <p>-Assesses using unbiased/accessible methods: None of the assessments are biased or inaccessible. The rubric paraphrasing step and the day 1 focus on the task provides increased clarity of purpose for students. In the third column in section three, there is information on scoring. There are lists of criteria for each day’s activity. A student meets the expectations if each criteria listed is met. This provides opportunities for formative assessment</p>
--	---

in order to adjust instruction to reinforce or reteach concepts.

-Includes aligned rubrics: In the third column in section three, there is information on scoring. There are lists of criteria for each day's activity. A student meets the expectations if each criteria listed is met. This provides opportunities for formative assessment in order to adjust instruction to reinforce or reteach concepts.

The task rubric on p. 24 is focused on focus, reading, idea, development, organization, and conventions. The same categories are used in the peer review. The day 1 rubric has an additional area (content understanding) as does the task rubric on p. 8. This could be confusing to students. The developer suggests that student work samples would be helpful in scoring and during instruction. Attaching said samples to the unit would be very helpful for both the student and the busy teacher using this lesson.

-Varied modes of assessment measures: Two reviewers disagreed upon the formative assessment provisions. One side felt that the mini-tasks created a formative assessment cycle throughout the module. While the other view was the formative assessment opportunities should be specifically identified to support the novice teacher.

The unit should include the 5.2 writing standard because the developer has included a writing rubric. The writing rubric needs to include understanding of theme and metaphor as the whole reason for the writing task was to have students share their understanding of theme and metaphor.

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

Summary Comments

This unit received a rating of 11, placing it in the Exemplary (E) category. A few changes will make this a stronger exemplary unit.

Overall the instruction supports students in meeting the purpose of the unit:

- 1) Deepen the students' ability to analyze meanings of metaphors in poetry.
- 2) Develop a better understanding of how an author develops a theme through word choice.
- 3) Allow students to demonstrate their learning through an informational essay.
- 4) Address ELA grade level specific standards.

Suggestions:

The addition of the W.5.2 standard to the module overview would reflect the writing instruction on Days 4-8.

Instructional supports (specific scaffolds) would benefit from addressing the needs of ELL and disabilities students.

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.