# EQuIP Review Feedback

**Lesson/Unit Name:** Satire: The Nose
**Content Area:** English language arts
**Grade Level:** 9

**Overall Rating:**

E

Exemplar

## Dimension I – Alignment to the Depth of the CCSS

| | |
|---|---|
| *The lesson/unit aligns with the letter and spirit of the CCSS:*<br>✓ Targets a set of grade-level CCSS ELA/Literacy standards.<br>✓ Includes a clear and explicit purpose for instruction.<br>✓ 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).<br>*A unit or longer lesson should:*<br>✓ Integrate reading, writing, speaking and listening so that students apply and synthesize advancing literacy skills.<br>❒ (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. | Standards/Purpose:<br>The unit clearly identifies a targeted set of Common Core State Standards for ELA/Literacy - RL9.1, RL9.5, W9.9, SL9.4 - as well as Massachusetts ELA Literacy 3A standard. The unit overview also clearly states a clear and explicit purpose for instruction, indicating that "students will learn key elements of satire and apply their knowledge in both reading and writing" (1) before explaining specific outcomes for each of the three sections of the unit as a whole:<br><br>Section 1 - Students learn the terms "exaggeration," "reversal," "incongruity," "parody" and apply them to various examples from pop culture and literature.<br><br>Section 2 - Students apply learned concepts to their reading of Gogol's "The Nose," as well as other satirical essays, in addition to demonstrating an understanding of how to analyze a piece of satirical writing using these ideas in multiple contexts.<br><br>Section 3 - Students apply their understanding of satire to their own writing by creating and performing a public service announcement, using satire to communicate a serious point.<br><br>Text Complexity/Integration of Language Skills:<br>Regarding the selection of texts, this unit is exemplary. The anchor text, Nikolai Gogol's "The Nose, as well as a variety of supplemental texts, seem appropriate regarding grade-level complexity, quality, and scope based on the purpose of the unit, and the resource list is extensive, nicely providing a myriad of alternatives. Similarly, the numerous lessons throughout the unit provide rich, consistent, engaging, and varying opportunities for students to build, apply, and synthesize their reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills.<br><br>Recommendations/Notes:<br>Although the unit identifies a specific set of standards, the lesson implicitly includes more standards than listed, and because this is a longer unit, the unit authors may consider including writing standards (perhaps 6, 7, 8, and/or 10). Additionally, the unit aligns to RL 6 as "The Nose" is authored by a Russian writer. Other standards that could be considered include RL 9.2 & 9.4.<br><br>It should be mentioned that previewing of texts prior to sharing with students is non-negotiable, as some of the pieces on the sites shared may not be appropriate for particular audiences. For example, a substitution for the piece from "The Onion" might be necessary, depending on where this lesson is taught and the level of sensitivity that needs to be honored. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Finally, the unit would be strengthened with the inclusion of qualitative and quantitative analysis of texts included within the unit. |
| 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:*<br>✓ **Reading Text Closely:** Makes reading text(s) closely, examining textual evidence, and discerning deep meaning a central focus of instruction.<br>✓ **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).<br>✓ **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).<br>✓ **Academic Vocabulary:** Focuses on building students' academic vocabulary in context throughout instruction.<br>*A unit or longer lesson should:*<br>❒ **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.<br>✓ **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.<br>✓ **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).<br>✓ **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. | Reading Text Closely:<br>The unit clearly focuses instruction on close reading, requiring students to also consider characteristics of satire when reading several texts closely (Gogol, Twain, etc.) in addition to providing students exposure to a variety of traditional texts (poems, nonfiction, fiction) as well as visual texts (such as political cartoons or photos of the Muppet painting parodies). In fact, the access to multiple text forms is noteworthy and will lead to strong student engagement. Likewise, as they interact with texts, students are afforded many opportunities to talk and move about, activities that are brain-friendly and best practices. Likewise, the unit allows for discussion and learning around Russian history, highly beneficial opportunities in developing concreteness and schema around the focus text. Texts are balanced very well.<br><br>The unit is structured as such that students will build knowledge from multiple sources and will make connections<br>among texts and learned material. The unit is sequenced to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of the specific ideas and particulars of the various texts. For example, Lesson 1 instructs to students to identify examples of satire within given texts. Next, Lessons 2-3 asks students to identify examples of the elements of satire while exploring real-world examples. Building further on the skills introduced, Lessons 4-8 task students with reading "The Nose" and citing evidence from the text to demonstrate mastery of the learned material. Additionally, the unit explores multiple formats and representations of satire to allow for comparisons and synthesis of the essential questions.<br><br>Text-Based Evidence:<br>Students participate in discussions grounded in evidence from the text. They are required to support claims and analyze specific chunks of text through close reading and guided questions. Additionally, students are exposed to examples of satire in various modes (e.g., political cartoons, on-line media, video).<br><br>Writing From Sources:<br>In addition to presenting a variety of texts for students to encounter, the writing expectations of the unit vary nicely, including journaling, open responses, annotations, two-sentence summaries, etc. In fact, routine writing in the form of journaling takes place on almost a daily basis. Likewise, chunks of text are selected for students to create written responses. Independent practice assessment of written analysis is also included throughout the unit.<br><br>Academic Vocabulary:<br>The unit adeptly supports the acquisition and use of academic language in Lessons 9-11, specifically addressing the use of Tier Two "general-academic" language to support the Tier Three "domain-specific" language of elements/characteristics of satire explored throughout the unit.<br><br>Recommendations/Notes:<br>Examples of Evidence-based questions are minimal. Inclusion of suggested |

| | |
|---|---|
| | specific, text-dependent questions in the unit plan would be helpful, or at least, the authors might mention a resource such as "http://achievethecore.org/page/710/text-dependent-question-resources" that teachers could access in order to have support in crafting text-dependent questions.<br><br>Also, at the times writing is expected, teachers will want to ensure there is enough time to let that visible thinking happen. For example, for lesson 8, it is suggested that students answer 4 critical questions (What was the object of Gogol's satire? What was Gogol's serious message? How did Gogol's writing style convey meaning? Was his use of humor effective to convey this message?) about Gogol's text via an exit ticket. A quick, formative out-the-door type of response may not provide students ample opportunity to show what they know regarding the crux of the lesson and may rob the teacher of the opportunity to see how much students know (or don't know) and how well they are transferring their reading skill sets. The questions asked seem to be the goal of the entire unit, so more time to explore the answers--and perhaps ask more questions of the text--would be of great value.<br><br>Regarding the balance of writing, journaling, annotating, and writing to craft and publish a PSA are the specific writing tasks. Inclusion of Higher Order Thinking questions beyond the Evidence-based questions would add to the richness of this unit and be helpful to colleagues and students.<br><br>While some attention to academic vocabulary is noted at points in the unit (Lesson 11, Appendix H, the characteristics of satire), a deliberate focus (or expanded discussion/activity) specifically drawing on CCSS 9.4, 9.5, and 9.6 is suggested, as the sophistication needed to recognize satire is completely dependent upon comprehension of the reading as well as understanding of the author's deliberate choices regarding syntax and diction.<br><br>Additionally, while there are many opportunities for reading/experiencing a wide-variety of texts (traditional and visual), the lesson seems to stop short of multiple opportunities for extended independent reading, as the most independent reading students do occurs in lessons 5 & 6. Providing suggestions for appropriate satirical texts for further independent reading would seem to be beneficial as well. |
| Rating: **3 – Meets most to all of the criteria in the dimension** | |

**Dimension III – Instructional Supports**

| | |
|---|---|
| *The lesson/unit is responsive to varied student learning needs:*<br>✓ Cultivates student interest and engagement in reading, writing and speaking about texts.<br>✓ Addresses instructional expectations and is easy to understand and use.<br>✓ Provides *all* 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.<br>✓ Focuses on challenging sections of text(s) and engages students in a productive struggle through discussion questions and other supports that build toward independence. | The study of satire lends itself well to cultivating student engagement. The unit engages students through the use of political cartoons, complex texts, and poetry. The texts are accessible to all learners given the supports and structures in place. In fact, students have multiple opportunities to engage with texts of multiple levels of complexity. The unit also allows for students to employ 21st century skills (creativity and collaboration) through the development of a satirical PSA. There are more writing goals with which this unit clearly aligns. The potential of the reach of this unit should be noted. Specifically, this unit aligns with CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.6, W.9-10.7, W.9-10.8, & W.9-10.10.<br><br>Integrates Supports:<br>Lesson 1 identifies potential misconceptions and preconceptions and provides terms and practices to utilize in order to integrate supports for ELL's (e.g., Think-alouds, Chunk and Chew, academic work groups). In Lesson 9, the teacher models inferring meaning of unknown words or phrases, |

| | |
|---|---|
| ✓ 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.<br>❒ Provides extensions and/or more advanced text for students who read well above the grade level text band.<br>*A unit or longer lesson should:*<br>❒ Include a progression of learning where concepts and skills advance and deepen over time (*may be more applicable across the year or several units*).<br>✓ Gradually remove supports, requiring students to demonstrate their independent capacities (*may be more applicable across the year or several units*).<br>✓ Provide for authentic learning, application of literacy skills, student-directed inquiry, analysis, evaluation and/or reflection.<br>❒ Integrate targeted instruction in such areas as grammar and conventions, writing strategies, discussion rules and all aspects of foundational reading for grades 3-5.<br>❒ 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*).<br>✓ Use technology and media to deepen learning and draw attention to evidence and texts as appropriate. | noting evidence from the text through using quotes and summarizing.<br><br>Grammar Conventions:<br>The unit does not specifically target instruction of grammar conventions; however, this omission does not weaken the overall unit.<br><br>Independent Reading:<br>The unit provides opportunities for independent reading and evaluating of traditional texts as well as visual texts (photographs, political cartoons, etc.).<br><br>Recommendations/Notes:<br>More explicit mention of supports and strategies for ELL's with disabilities and those who read below grade level would be helpful. Additionally, it is not clear how students are accountable for independent reading or whether or not the independent reading that does occur within the unit is sufficient to build stamina, confidence, and motivation. Since the independent reading that occurs is assigned by the teacher or guided by instruction, the unit could provide opportunities for extended learning that provides for student choice of appropriate texts that would allow students to practice and apply the reading skills fostered by the unit's reading activities.<br><br>Suggestions for improvement include taking another look at time allotted for particular activities to see if longer periods of time could be spent on reflecting and writing (lesson 8) and seeing if time can be trimmed from other lessons, such as lessons 2 & 3. Time is a support, and much more time and specific and intentional support needs to be provided for ELL's and exceptional students--those with disabilities as well as those who are gifted. While there is mention of more than one translation of the short story and that the complexity levels of the story differ, there are not other opportunities shared for students who read well above grade level to experience compacting of the curriculum/differentiated instruction. All students seem to be doing the same things with the same content. Regarding ELL's, they will need extensive support with language and the ways it is used, as stopping at literal interpretations of the text will not achieve the goals of understanding what satire is and why it's important. |
| Rating: **3 – Meets most to all of the criteria in the dimension** | |

**Dimension IV – Assessment**

| | |
|---|---|
| *The lesson/unit regularly assesses whether students are mastering standards-based content and skills:*<br>✓ 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).<br>✓ Assesses student proficiency using methods that are unbiased and accessible to all students.<br>✓ Includes aligned rubrics or assessment guidelines that provide sufficient guidance for interpreting student performance.<br>*A unit or longer lesson should:*<br>✓ Use varied modes of assessment, including a range of pre-, formative, summative and self-assessment measures. | A reader-response rubric is used to evaluate the degree to which students can independently demonstrate the major targeted grade level CCSS, and a formal, independent assessment is given in Lesson 11 to allow students the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of the elements of satire. A rubric is included in Appendix D. Various modes of assessment are included throughout the lessons, including formative assessment of group discussions and homework, and the PSA and formal written open responses provide clear examples of summative assessments of skills/standards.<br><br>Recommendations/Notes:<br>Rubrics that provide guidance for interpreting performance are provided; yet, if the Twain piece is not the text selected for use for lessons 9 & 10, the rubric (p. 54 in Appendix D) will need to be modified to match the text being studied.<br><br>While there is evidence of formative, summative, and self-assessments, no evidence of pre-assessments are noted. Pre-assessment is invaluable as a planning tool, as use of the data will allow teachers to be more deliberate |

| | |
|---|---|
| | and focused on instructional moves that will best engage and support students. Data allows for better crafting of lessons and assignments based on true needs of the students. Levels of self-efficacy can increase when students see positive, concrete growth based on their performance, and increased self-efficacy will yield higher levels of engagement and a stronger commitment to learning. |
| Rating: **3 – Meets most to all of the criteria in the dimension** | |

## Summary Comments

The unit is clearly aligned to the Common Core State Standards for ELA 9-10, and the text variety (regarding text types and levels of complexity) is excellent, allowing for students to build knowledge through various modes of text. Likewise, the lessons foster student immersion the content and concept each day of the unit.

A strength of the unit is its usability: the systematic organization provides a clear understanding of the design of the lessons and ease locating materials to use. The layout of the unit is user friendly, and the Unit Plan and General Notes are well done in that they are brief, well-organized, and comprehensive. Notes for expected student misconceptions and preconceived notions are helpful, as well as the General Notes and resources which provide terms and strategies for struggling readers.

Additionally, the opening documents make it evident that the backward planning framework and approach were used to guide instructional design. Students have multiple opportunities to cultivate their 4 C's skills through collaborating and creating--particularly with the culminating PSA performance task. The use of stations to go from individual thinking to whole-group sharing is a great way to support and extend thinking and sharing of perspectives.

Suggestions for improvement:
The title of this unit indicates that the focus of the lesson is "The Nose"; however, 450 minutes (9-10 45-minute periods) --over half of the time allotted for the unit--are marked for production of a 30-60 second PSA. Fourteen days are spent on the group activity, and three days are spent with introductory and literary elements activities. This leaves eight days--at best--for reading and exploring complex texts and employing sophisticated skill sets to interact and extract deeper meaning and purpose from texts. Perhaps a shifting of time allocated could ensure more time for reading.

Also, monitoring and tracking student thinking (i.e. documenting student conversations on anchor charts) would be helpful and allow for teachers to support students via 2 modalities of learning, which will increase comprehension exponentially.

Finally, it would be helpful to share grouping protocols/guidelines, as intentional grouping can be an excellent support for all students, regardless of level/ability, and it would be helpful to reiterate the need to preview all materials prior to using them in class. (Perhaps repeat the statement by the 4th bullet on the right-hand side of page 10.)

***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.