ELA High-Value Action Revision Tool

Title of Resource: *Scoreboost Writing Across the Tests: Sentence Structure, Usage, and Mechanics*

Source/Publisher: New Reader's Press   **Date of Publication**: 2013   **Evaluation Date**: August 9, 2018 Tammy Twiggs

Determine the high-value actions needed to fill gaps for the dimensions that make up each criterion.
Identify the high-value action(s) related to each criterion that will strengthen the alignment of the resource to the CCRS.

Criterion #1—Text Complexity: Does the resource provide regular practice with complex text and its academic language?

Dimension 1.1	Dimension 1.2
Text Complexity and Quality: *Most* of the texts included in the resource are at the appropriate level of complexity as defined by the CCR standards; all texts are worth reading.	**Academic Vocabulary:** The resource *regularly* focuses on understanding words and phrases, their relationships, and nuances, particularly general academic words and phrases.
• The resource does not contain complex texts because it is a Language resource. • The short reading excerpts measure between 800-900 lexile.	• There is not a focus on Academic vocabulary because the resource is primarily for grammar, mechanics, and usage.

Resource Criterion Rating[1]:   Strong   ☐   Modifications Necessary   ☐   Weak   ☐

High-value actions needed to fill the gaps (check all actions that apply):

❑ Gather information about the quantitative and qualitative complexity of the text. (For published material, contact the program, publisher, or sales representative for the information.)

❑ If most of the passages reviewed match a lower level of learning, recommend the resource/lesson/unit be used for that level instead.

❑ Identify high-value academic vocabulary that should be addressed.

❑ Create questions/activities that engage learners with academic vocabulary.

❑ Other:

Weaknesses
• The source is not intended for CCRS Reading Anchor instruction, and it should not be used for Criterion 1 because the teacher would need to make too many changes to the source to use it for Criterion 1.
• This is a GED Test-Prep source for writing, not for reading. Doing a quantitative analysis on five passages throughout the source revealed that the lexile is between 800 to 900, placing it at the Level C Common Core Band.
• The passages are not complex qualitatively, so would not be effective for reading instruction.

❑ Additional notes on above actions

Criterion #2—Evidence: Does the resource provide reading, writing, and speaking activities grounded in evidence from text?

Dimension 2.1	Dimension 2.2
Growth of Comprehension and Using Evidence From Texts: An *overwhelming majority (80%)* of all questions reviewed are high-quality, text-dependent, and text-specific questions. • All questions are test-prep questions, multiple-choice, and not text-dependent. • Student will not build their comprehension skills by using this resource.	**Emphasis on Argumentative and Informative Writing and Speaking:** An *overwhelming majority (80%)* of all writing and speaking assignments reviewed require argumentative and informative writing and speaking. They require students to draw on evidence from texts to present careful analyses and well-defended claims. • There are no Argumentative or Informative writing prompts included with this resource. • There is Language support for writing.

Resource Criterion Rating[1]: Strong ☐ <mark>Modifications Necessary ☐</mark> (Language support for writing)

<mark>Weak ☐</mark> (Comprehension and Text Evidence)

High-value actions needed to fill the gaps (check all actions that apply):

❏   Replace non-text-dependent questions with valuable text-dependent questions that target level-specific standards.

❏   Create coherent sequences of text dependent questions to build understanding and analysis.

❏   Add a variety of text-based writing assignments, including short and longer writing assignments developed from the central ideas of the text.

❏   Add a culminating writing assignment developed from the central understanding of the text(s).

❏   Create thought-provoking questions that elicit rich discussion.

<mark>❏   Increase the amount of argumentative and informative writing and speaking opportunities.</mark>

❏   Incorporate read alouds and, when applicable, illustrations, audio/video and other media.

❏   Other:

<mark>**Modifications Necessary**</mark>

• This text would be useful in providing Language instructional support for writing Argumentative and Informational essays, but it would be supplemental instructional support.

• The teacher would need to assess the learners to determine if the topics covered in the book are appropriate for individual student needs.

• The teacher would need to create text-based writing assignments or Argumentative and Informative writing prompts to supplement this text.

<mark>**Weakness**</mark>

• The source is not intended for CCRS Reading Anchor instruction, and it should not be used for Criterion 2 to build comprehension and practice close reading for text evidence because the teacher would need to make too many changes to the source to use it for Criterion 2.

❏   Additional notes on above actions

Criterion #3—Knowledge: Does the resource build knowledge through content-rich nonfiction?

Dimension 3.1	Dimension 3.2
Emphasis on Reading Content-Rich Texts: The resource *accentuates* comprehending quality informational texts independently across disciplines.	**Building Knowledge Through Reading Widely About a Topic and Research:** *Most* passages reviewed are organized around a topic or line of inquiry; the resource includes regular research assignments.
• None of the reading passages are content-rich texts.	• There are no writing topics or research opportunities.
• There are no passages that would help readers build content-area knowledge.	

Resource Criterion Rating[1]: Strong ☐   Modifications Necessary ☐   <mark>Weak ☐</mark>

High-value actions needed to fill the gaps (check all actions that apply):

❏ Create a list of supplemental texts on the same topic to promote volume of reading and build knowledge.

❏ Add writing and discussion tasks that encourage students to draw information from multiple texts around a topic.

❏ Create brief research projects for students on the same topic.

❏ Other:

<mark>**Weaknesses**</mark>

• In terms of qualitative measures, the text passages are not complex.
• The passages do not contain cross-content knowledge, so there is no opportunity for students to build knowledge about different disciplines.
• There are no writing prompts or research opportunities.
• The source is not intended for CCRS Reading Anchor instruction, and it should not be used for Criterion 3 to expose students to content-rich texts.
• There are no research opportunities, and the teacher would need to make too many changes to the source to use it for Criterion 3.

❏ Additional notes on above actions

Criterion #4—Instructional Support and Assessment: Does the resource provide structure and support for standards-aligned instruction and assessment?

Dimension 4.1	Dimension 4.2
Instructional Support: The resource is responsive to varied student learning needs. • There are no instructional supports in place to scaffold or differentiate instruction for ELLs or struggling readers.	**Assessment:** The resource *regularly* provides opportunities to assess whether students are mastering standards-based content and skills. • This is an excellent resource to support specific CCRS Language requirements for sentence structure, usage, and mechanics.

Resource Criterion Rating[1]: Strong ☐ Modifications Necessary ☐ (Language Assessment)

Weak ☐ (Instructional Support)

High-value actions needed to fill the gaps (check all actions that apply):

❏ Provide supplemental visuals, sentence frames, read alouds, vocabulary definitions, or other supports to allow ALL students to access the work of the lesson.

❏ Provide relevant contexts for learners such as career, community, or academic subjects for the purposes of building knowledge.

❏ Provide evidence-based reading resources to support students who need more time and attention to achieve automaticity with decoding, phonemic awareness, fluency and/or vocabulary acquisition.

❏ Incorporate varied modes of curriculum-embedded assessments that may include pre-, formative, summative and self-assessment measures (for curricular units and published resources only).

❏ Include standards-aligned rubrics or assessment guidelines that provide sufficient guidance for interpreting student performance.

❏ Other:

Modifications Necessary
• In terms of CCRS Language assessment, it is a good resource to support specific areas of sentence structure, usage, and mechanics.
• With only multiple-choice assessment, the teacher would need to create other forms of assessment to ensure that the students are achieving proficiency in the target Language standards.

Weak
• The resource is a GED Test Prep resource, and there are not supports included to provide instructional differentiation or scaffolds to help struggling readers and ELLs.
• Students would need a high level of independence to access the resource and use it because there are very few instructional examples or guidance.

❏ Additional notes on above actions