**Criteria Discussion Guide – ELA/Literacy K-2**

**Purpose**

This criteria guide is intended for use by facilitators to guide conversations during norming or calibration sessions.

**Overall Guidance**

As reviewers work to norm and/or calibrate judgments, be prepared to guide conversations among table and whole groups in order to surface and resolve misconceptions about the interpretation of the criteria in each dimension. After reviewers have checked dimensional criteria, recorded observations, and discussed their feedback as a group, ask tables to share reflections with the room. *Use the examples of criterion-based feedback and ratings in the slides to guide reviewers to reflect on the quality of the observations and feedback they have generated.* Compare both the degree to which observations are based on the examples found in the common unit and the degree to which the suggestions are framed in the language and spirit of the criteria. Explain that criteria may only be checked if there is clear and substantial evidence of the criterion (there are no “half-checks”). *There may be instances when reviewers find clear and substantial evidence of a criterion and there are still constructive suggestions that can be made.* In such cases, reviewers may provide feedback related to criteria that have been checked*.* Remember too, while the rubric should accurately reflect what a given set of materials does and does not do, a lesson or unit need not meet all criteria within a Dimension to earn a “3.” A rating of “3” requires only that most (or all) criteria in a Dimension are met. Likewise, high quality lessons need not meet every single criterion to be rated Exemplary. What’s most important is that consumers of these materials understand their strengths and any recommendations that would further strengthen them.

**Guidance by Dimension**

**Dimension I: Alignment to the Depth of the CCSS**

Note that 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.

Read aloud the criteria for Dimension I and note the distinction between the criteria for a lesson/unit and the additional criteria for units and longer lessons.

* If reviewing a lesson, clarify that the first three criteria in Dimension I are applicable.
* If reviewing a unit or longer lesson, clarify that all criteria in Dimension I are applicable.

As reviewers apply the criteria in Dimension I, it may be helpful to ask the following questions regarding criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4:

* + For criterion 1 – Does the teacher/developer articulate alignment to a reasonable number of standards? Do the assignments, tasks and activities suggest a set of standards has been targeted for instruction? Does the teacher/developer make a distinction between targeted and supporting standards? Do the assignments and activities make sense given the standards listed?
	+ For criterion 2 – Where in the lesson/unit is the instructional purpose communicated? Is the purpose for instruction well-aligned to the standards identified and/or the assignments and activities? Remember there are different ways to capture “clear and explicit purpose”; the rubric is template-agnostic.
	+ For criterion 3 – Is the text of sufficient quality ***and*** scope for the instructional purpose? Does the text present characteristics similar to the K-2 exemplars in the CCSS Appendix B? For grade 2, does the text measure within the grade-level complexity band?
* For criterion 4 – Does the lesson/unit provide opportunities for students to present ideas and information through writing and/or drawing and speaking experiences?

**Dimension II: Key Shifts in the CCSS**

Read the criteria aloud, noting the distinction between the criteria for a lesson/unit and the additional criteria for units and longer lessons.

As the team(s) review, circulate and use questions to support reviewers at their tables.

* What direct evidence can I cite that supports my decisions?
* For criteria not yet met, what constructive observations and suggestions for improvement can I make?
* Can I connect my observations and suggestions to specific evidence from the instructional materials (both what I see and do not see)?

As reviewers apply the criteria in Dimension II, it may be helpful to ask the following questions regarding criteria 1, 2 and 3:

* For criterion 1: Is a text and the evidence contained within it the central focus of the lesson? Is it clear from the lesson that a majority of class time is to be spent reading, writing, or speaking directly about a text or texts? Are students being asked to read and reread (or listen to) the text, think deeply about it, participate in thoughtful discussions, and grapple with the particulars of the text?
* For criterion 2: Is there a series of questions that require evidence from text ***that*** work together to facilitate rich conversations and writing? If these types of questions are present, reviewers should check the criteria. *(Note: There may be instances when reviewers find clear and substantial evidence of this criterion and constructive suggestions that can be made. In such cases, reviewers should provide feedback related to criteria that have been checked.)*
* For criterion 3: Does the lesson/unit explicitly focus on building students’ academic vocabulary and concepts of syntax? Academic vocabulary is important in K-2 and there may be instances where lessons/units focus on academic vocabulary more overtly than others. If there is clear evidence that academic language is taught within the lesson/unit, this criterion should be checked.

*Note: Checking the criteria in a manner that accurately reflects the evidence in the instructional material will help reviewers to provide targeted feedback and demonstrate common judgment about the criteria in Dimension II.*

**Dimension III: Instructional Supports**

Read the criteria aloud, noting the distinction between the criteria for a lesson/unit and the additional criteria for units and longer lessons.

As reviewers apply the criteria in Dimension III, it may be helpful to ask the following questions regarding criteria 2, 3, and 6:

* For criterion 2: Does this set of materials address instructional expectations? Is it easy to understand and follow? Are the teacher resources (annotated responses, supports for ELLs, SPED, etc.) clear?
* For criterion 3: Does this lesson/unit integrate targeted instruction in multiple areas such as grammar and syntax, writing strategies, discussion rules and aspects of foundational reading? This is of particular importance in K-2 and as reviewers indicate evidence that integration included in the lesson/unit, they would check this criterion.
* For criterion 6: Does this lesson/unit focus on sections of rich text(s) (including read alouds) that present the greatest challenge? Do discussion questions and other supports promote student engagement? Rich text(s) are texts that are worthy of rereading, include Tier 2 words, incorporate layers of meaning, and serve as mentor texts for writing. Challenging sections often require scaffolding for close reading.

*Note: Checking the criteria in a manner that accurately reflects the evidence in the instructional material will help reviewers to provide targeted feedback and demonstrate common judgment about the criteria in Dimension III.*

**Guidance for Dimension IV: Assessment**

Read the criteria aloud, noting the distinction between the criteria for a lesson/unit and the additional criteria for a unit and longer lesson.

As reviewers apply the criteria for Dimension IV, it may be helpful to ask the following questions regarding criteria 2 and 3:

* For criterion 2: Do students have multiple ways to show what they have learned?
* For criterion 3: Do assessments produce descriptions of how close students have come to meeting expectations (e.g., annotated student work, descriptive rubrics/checklists)?

*Note: Checking the criteria in a manner that accurately reflects the evidence in the instructional material will help reviewers to provide targeted feedback and demonstrate common judgment about the criteria in Dimension IV.*