**RESOURCE ALIGNMENT TOOL FOR**

**English Language Arts/Literacy**

**1. Rate the resource against the criteria in the English Language Arts (ELA)/Literacy Resource Alignment Tool.1** Use the dimensions and the evidence statements in the tool to guide your ratings. Record strengths and weaknesses for each key criterion (Text Complexity, Evidence, and Knowledge).2

**2. 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 your college and career readiness (CCR) standards. High- value actions are those that will bring your resource into much closer alignment to the standards. In many cases, while the actions take some effort, they can be efficiently executed.

**3. Give an overall score for the resource.** Summarize the overall strengths and weaknesses of the resource with respect to the three criteria to score the resource.

**4. Align the resource to the Framew. ork.** Determine where the resource best fits in the

Curriculum Framework.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Individual Dimension Rating Descriptors | |
| Meets | There is evidence in the resource to indicate that the dimension is met. |
| Partially Meets | There is evidence in the resource to indicate that the dimension can be met with some revision. |
| Does Not Meet (Insufficient Evidence) | There is little or no evidence in the resource to indicate that the dimension is being met. Substantial revision is needed for alignment. |

1 Adapted from *Publishers’ Criteria for the Common Core State Standards in ELA/Literacy for Grades 3-12.* Washington, DC. Accessed January 13, 2015. [http://www.corestandards.org/search/?f=all&t=Publishers%27+Criteria, and](http://www.corestandards.org/search/?f=all&t=Publishers%27+Criteria,) *Toolkit for Evaluating Alignment of Instructional and Assessment Materials to the Common Core State Standards*. [http://achievethecore.org/content/](http://achievethecore.org/content/upload/Materials) [upload/Materials-Alignment-Toolkit\_Version2%20(9)[1].pdf](http://achievethecore.org/content/upload/Materials-Alignment-Toolkit_Version2%20(9)%5b1%5d.pdf)

2 There are other essential elements of CCR standards—and of good literacy instruction—that are not represented in the criteria below because they do not require a key shift in instruction. Foundations of Reading—represented in CCR standards—are necessary and important components of an effective, comprehensive reading program. They have long been part of literacy programs, so they tend to be well represented in existing resources and don’t require attention as a “gap” in alignment.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension 1.1 | Meets | Partially  Meets | Does Not Meet  (Insufficient Evidence) |
|  |  |  |
| **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. *(Support document: Quantitative and Qualitative Text Complexity Resources)* | Guiding Questions:  • Are most texts within the appropriate band of complexity  for the level?  • Have the texts and other stimuli been previously  published or are they of publishable quality?  • Are the texts content-rich? Do they exhibit exceptional craft and thought or provide useful information? | | |
| Dimension 1.2 | Meets | Partially  Meets | Does Not Meet  (Insufficient Evidence) |
|  |  |  |
| **Academic Vocabulary:** The resource *regularly* focuses on understanding words and phrases, their relationships, and nuances, particularly general academic words and phrases. | Guiding Questions:  • How is vocabulary handled in the resource?  • Are academic vocabulary words targeted? Are they central to understanding the specific text?  • Are questions asked about vocabulary and authors’ word  choices? | | |
| **Summary of strengths and weaknesses:**  **High-value actions needed to fill the gaps (check all actions that apply):**  ❏❏ Ask the publisher of the resource to provide information about the quantitative and qualitative complexity of the texts.  ❏❏ Conduct qualitative analyses of passages to differentiate between the texts worth reading and those not worth reading.  ❏❏ If most of the passages reviewed match a lower level of learning, recommend the resource be used for that level instead.  ❏❏ Identify high-value academic vocabulary that should be addressed in the lesson.  ❏❏ Other: | | | |

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension 2.1 | Meets | Partially  Meets | Does Not Meet  (Insufficient Evidence) |
|  |  |  |
| **Growth of Comprehension and Using Evidence From Texts:** An *overwhelming majority (80%)* of all questions reviewed are high-quality, text-dependent, and text-specific. *(Support document: Checklist for Evaluating Question Quality)* | Guiding Questions:  • Do the questions focus students on the text? Do they require readers to produce evidence from the text?  • Do questions ask about central ideas of the text?  • Do they gradually build understanding of the text?  • Do they address level-specific standard(s)? | | |
| Dimension 2.2 | Meets | Partially  Meets | Does Not Meet  (Insufficient Evidence) |
|  |  |  |
| **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. *(Support document: Checklist for Evaluating Question Quality)* | Guiding Questions:  • Are there regular invitations for students to speak about  the reading?  • Do most writing and speaking assignments require  students to provide text-based evidence? Do they make up  80% of the writing and speaking assignments?  • Are there regular opportunities to write arguments and  informative pieces? | | |
| **Summary of strengths and weaknesses:**  **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.  ❏❏ 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.  ❏❏ Other: | | | |

**Criterion Knowledge: Does the resource build knowledge through content- rich nonfiction?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension 3.1 | Meets | Partially  Meets | Does Not Meet  (Insufficient Evidence) |
|  |  |  |
| **Emphasis on Reading Content- Rich Texts:** The resource *accentuates* comprehending quality informational texts across disciplines. | Guiding Questions:  • Are most of the texts content-rich and informational  texts that promote learning and thinking?  • Does the resource promote regular independent reading? | | |
| Dimension 3.2 | Meets | Partially  Meets | Does Not Meet  (Insufficient Evidence) |
|  |  |  |
| **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. | Guiding Questions:  • How well does the resource build knowledge on a single  topic?  • Are the passages carefully sequenced to increase  knowledge on a topic or focus area of inquiry?  • Does the resource offer regular (short) research  opportunities? | | |
| **Summary of strengths and weaknesses:**  **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 students’ volume of reading and to build knowledge.  ❏❏ Create brief research projects for students on the same topic.  ❏❏ Other: | | | |

**Overall Rating and placement in the Framework:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tight  Alignment | Most (four or more) of the dimensions are rated as **Meets**, with the remainder rated as Partially Meets. There are only a few minor revisions (or none at all) needed to improve alignment of the resource with the CCR standards. |  |
| Partial  Alignment | Most (four or more) of the dimensions are rated at least as **Partially Meets**. Moderate revisions are needed to improve alignment of the resource with the CCR standards. |  |
| Weak  Alignment | Most (three or more) of the dimensions are rated as **Does Not Meet**. Substantial revisions are needed to improve alignment of the resource with the CCR standards. |  |
| **Summary of key strengths and weaknesses:** | | |

**Notes:**

Focus of text-dependent questions (check those that apply):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ❏ Focus on determining central ideas or themes and analyzing their development (CCR Reading Standard 2) | ❏ Focus on summarizing  the key supporting details and ideas (CCR Reading Standard 2) | ❏ Focus on analyzing how and why individuals, events, and ideas develop and interact (CCR Reading Standard 3) |
| ❏ Focus on why the author chose a particular word/ phrase (CCR Reading Standard 4) | ❏ Focus on defining the most powerful academic words (CCR Reading Standard 4) | ❏ Focus on how specific word choices shape meaning and tone (CCR Reading Standard 4) |
| ❏ Focus on examining the impact of sentence or paragraph structures or patterns (CCR Reading Standard 5) | ❏ Focus on looking for pivot points in the paragraph or sections of the text (CCR Reading Standard 5) | ❏ Focus on how an author’s ideas are developed and refined by particular sentences, paragraphs, etc. (CCR Reading Standard 5) |
| ❏ Focus on how point of view or purpose shapes the content or style (CCR Reading Standard 6) | ❏ Focus on integrating and evaluating content presented in diverse media and formats (CCR Reading Standard 7) | ❏ Focus on specific claims and overarching arguments (CCR Reading Standard 8) |
| ❏ Focus on the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence authors present (CCR Reading Standard 8) | ❏ Focus on how two or more texts address similar themes or topics (CCR Reading Standard 9) | ❏ Focus on how authors writing about the same topic shape their presentation  of key information (CCR  Reading Standard 9) |

List level-specific, text-dependent questions based on the focus areas identified in the chart

above.6

6 Refer to the Checklist for Evaluating Question Quality for assistance with items 9 and 10.
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QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE TEXT COMPLEXITY RESOURCES

Quantitative and Qualitative Text Complexity

Resources

The first advance in college and career readiness standards is “regular practice with complex text.” The following tools help reviewers place texts of certain complexity levels within an adult education level of learning. There are both quantitative measures and qualitative measures. Educators should first use *quantitative measures* to locate a text within a band level. Once a text is located within a band by using quantitative measures, educators should use *qualitative measures* to determine other important aspects of texts and position a text at the high, middle, or low end of a band.

***Access to Quantitative Analysis Tools***

Use these directions to access various quantitative analysis or machine scoring tools. There is no fee to use any of these tools.

**ATOS Analyzer: Renaissance Learning**

[**www.renaissance.com/Products/Accelerated-Reader/ATOS/ATOS-Analyzer-for-Text**](http://www.renaissance.com/Products/Accelerated-Reader/ATOS/ATOS-Analyzer-for-Text)

1. Select “ATOS for text.”

2. Copy and paste your text into the window and hit submit. Note: There is no ability to create an account and store results.

QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE TEXT COMPLEXITY RESOURCES

***Quantitative Analysis Chart for Determining Text Complexity***

This chart represents the “staircase” of text complexity that will allow students to reach levels of proficiency that will be used to deem them college- and career-ready once they exit Level E.1 For more information about its research base, see New Research on Text Complexity.2

Reading levels have been bundled into five grade-level groupings—A (K–1), B (2–3), C (4–5), D (6–8), and E (9–12)—to more closely reflect adult education levels of learning: Beginning Adult Basic Education Literacy, Beginning Basic Education, Low Intermediate Basic Education, High Intermediate Basic Education, and Low Adult Secondary and High Adult Secondary Education.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CCR Levels**  **of Learning** | **ATOS Analyzer** | **Degrees of Reading Power** | **Flesch- Kincaid** | **The Lexile**  **Framework** | **Reading**  **Maturity** |
| B (2nd – 3rd) | 2.75 – 5.14 | 42 – 54 | 1.98 – 5.34 | 420 – 820 | 3.53 – 6.13 |
| C (4th – 5th) | 4.97 – 7.03 | 52 – 60 | 4.51 – 7.73 | 740 – 1010 | 5.42 – 7.92 |
| D (6th – 8th) | 7.00 – 9.98 | 57 – 67 | 6.51 – 10.34 | 925 – 1185 | 7.04 – 9.57 |
| E (9th – 10th) | 9.67 – 12.01 | 62 – 72 | 8.32 – 12.12 | 1050 – 1335 | 8.41 – 10.81 |
| E (11th – CCR) | 11.20 – 14.10 | 67 – 74 | 10.34 – 14.2 | 1185 – 1385 | 9.57 – 12.00 |

1 Pimentel, S. (2013). *College and Career Readiness Standards for Adult Education.* Berkeley, CA: MPR Associates, Inc. [http://](http://lincs.ed.gov/publications/pdf/CCRStandardsAdultEd.pdf)

[lincs.ed.gov/publications/pdf/CCRStandardsAdultEd.pdf](http://lincs.ed.gov/publications/pdf/CCRStandardsAdultEd.pdf)

2 National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. n.d. *Supplemental*

*Information for Appendix A of the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy: New Research on Text Complexity.* Washington, DC. Accessed April 1, 2013. [http://www.corestandards.org/assets/E0813\_Appendix\_A\_New\_Research\_](http://www.corestandards.org/assets/E0813_Appendix_A_New_Research_on_Text_Complexity.pdf) [on\_Text\_Complexity.pdf](http://www.corestandards.org/assets/E0813_Appendix_A_New_Research_on_Text_Complexity.pdf)

***Qualitative Analysis Rubric for Informational Texts*** 3

The following rubric includes all the factors to consider for making qualitative judgments about the complexity of informational texts.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Text Author:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Text Title:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Feature Slightly Complex Moderately Complex Very Complex Exceedingly Complex**

**STRUCTURE Organization:** Connections among ideas, processes,

or events are explicit and clear; organization of text is chronological, sequential, or easy to predict.

**Text Features:** If used,

help the reader navigate and understand content but are

not essential to understanding content.

**Graphics:** If used, are simple and unnecessary

to understanding the text, but may support and assist readers in understanding the text.

**Organization:** Connections among some ideas or events are implicit or subtle; organization is evident and generally sequential or chronological.

**Text Features:** If used, enhance the reader’s understanding of content.

**Graphics:** If used, are mostly supplemental to understanding the text.

**Organization:** Connections among an expanded range of ideas, processes, or events are often implicit or subtle; organization may contain multiple pathways or exhibit

some discipline-specific traits.

**Text Features:** If used, directly enhance the reader’s understanding of content.

**Graphics:** If used, support or are integral to understanding the text.

**Organization:** Connections among an extensive range of ideas, processes, or events are deep, intricate, and often ambiguous; organization

is intricate or discipline-

specific.

**Text Features:** If used, are essential in understanding content.

**Graphics:** If used, are intricate, extensive, and integral to making meaning of the text; may provide information not otherwise conveyed in the text.

**LANGUAGE CLARITY AND CONVENTIONS**

**Conventionality:**

Language is explicit, literal, straightforward, and easy to understand.

**Conventionality:** Language

is largely explicit and easy to understand, with some occasions for more complex meaning.

**Conventionality:** Language is fairly complex; contains some abstract, ironic, and/or figurative language.

**Conventionality:** Language is dense and complex; contains considerable abstract, ironic, and/or figurative language.

**Feature Slightly Complex Moderately Complex Very Complex Exceedingly Complex**

**LANGUAGE CLARITY AND CONVENTIONS** *(continued)*

**Vocabulary:** Words are contemporary, familiar, and conversational.

**Sentence Structure:** Uses mainly simple sentences.

**Vocabulary:** Words are mostly contemporary, familiar, and conversational; rarely overly academic.

**Sentence Structure:**

Uses primarily simple and compound sentences, with some complex constructions.

**Vocabulary:** Words are fairly complex and sometimes unfamiliar, archaic, subject- specific, or overly academic.

**Sentence Structure:** Uses many complex sentences, with several subordinate phrases or clauses and transition words.

**Vocabulary:** Words are complex and generally unfamiliar, archaic, subject- specific, or overly academic; may be ambiguous or purposefully misleading.

**Sentence Structure:** Uses mainly complex sentences, with several subordinate clauses or phrases and transition words; sentences often contain multiple concepts.

**KNOWLEDGE**

**DEMANDS**

**Subject Matter Knowledge:** Relies on everyday, practical knowledge; includes simple, concrete ideas.

**Intertextuality:** Includes

no references or allusions to other texts, or outside ideas, theories, etc.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:** Relies on common, practical knowledge and some discipline-specific content knowledge; includes a mix of simple and more complicated, abstract ideas.

**Intertextuality:** Includes

few references or allusions to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:**

Relies on moderate levels of discipline-specific or theoretical knowledge; includes a mix of recognizable ideas and

challenging abstract concepts.

**Intertextuality:** Includes some references or allusions

to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:**

Relies on extensive levels of discipline-specific or theoretical knowledge; includes a range of challenging abstract concepts.

**Intertextuality:**

Includes many references

or allusions to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.

**PURPOSE Purpose:** Is explicitly stated, clear, concrete, and narrowly focused.

**Purpose:** Is implied but easy to identify based on context or source.

**Purpose:** Is implicit or subtle but fairly easy to infer; is more theoretical or abstract than concrete.

**Purpose:** Is subtle and intricate, and difficult to determine; includes many theoretical or abstract elements.
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***Qualitative Analysis Rubric for Literary Texts*** 4

The following rubric includes all the factors to consider for making qualitative judgments about the complexity of literary texts.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Text Author:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Text Title:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Feature**  **STRUCTURE** | **Slightly Complex**  **Organization:** Is clear, chronological, or easy to predict.  **Graphics:** If used, are simple and unnecessary  to understanding the text, but may support and assist readers in understanding the text. | **Moderately Complex**  **Organization:** May have two or more storylines and occasionally be difficult to predict.  **Graphics:** If used, are mostly supplemental to understanding the text. | **Very Complex**  **Organization:** May include subplots, time shifts, and complex characters.  **Graphics:** If used, support or are integral to understanding the text. | **Exceedingly Complex**  **Organization:** Is intricate with regard to elements such as point of view, time shifts, multiple characters, storylines, and detail.  **Graphics:** If used, are intricate, extensive, and integral to making meaning of the text; may provide information not otherwise convened in the text. |
| **LANGUAGE CLARITY AND CONVENTIONS** | **Conventionality:**  Language is explicit, literal, straightforward, and easy to understand. | **Conventionality:** Language  is largely explicit and easy to understand, with some occasions for more complex meaning. | **Conventionality:** Language is fairly complex; contains some abstract, ironic, and/or figurative language. | **Conventionality:** Language is dense and complex; contains considerable abstract, ironic, and/or figurative language. |

4

Adapted from *Appendix A: Research Supporting Key Elements of the Standards, Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies and Science and Technical Subjects* (2010).
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**Feature Slightly Complex Moderately Complex Very Complex Exceedingly Complex**

**LANGUAGE CLARITY AND CONVENTIONS** *(continued)*

**Vocabulary:** Words are contemporary, familiar, and conversational.

**Sentence Structure:** Uses mainly simple sentences.

**Vocabulary:** Words are mostly contemporary, familiar, and conversational; rarely overly academic.

**Sentence Structure:**

Uses primarily simple and compound sentences, with some complex constructions.

**Vocabulary:** Words are fairly complex and sometimes unfamiliar, archaic, subject- specific, or overly academic.

**Sentence Structure:** Uses many complex sentences, with several subordinate phrases or clauses and transition words.

**Vocabulary:** Words are complex and generally unfamiliar, archaic, subject- specific, or overly academic; may be ambiguous or purposefully misleading.

**Sentence Structure:** Uses mainly complex sentences, with several subordinate clauses or phrases and transition words; sentences often contain multiple concepts.

**KNOWLEDGE**

**DEMANDS**

**Life Experiences:** Explores a single theme; experiences portrayed are everyday and common to most readers.

**Intertextuality:** Includes no reference or allusion to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.

**Life Experiences:** Explores several themes; experiences portrayed are common to many readers.

**Intertextuality:** Includes

few references or allusions to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.

**Life Experiences:** Explores themes of varying levels of complexity or abstraction; experiences portrayed are uncommon to most readers.

**Intertextuality:** Includes some references or allusions

to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.

**Life Experiences:** Explores complex, sophisticated, or abstract themes; experiences portrayed are distinctly different from those of most readers.

**Intertextuality:** Includes many references or allusions to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.

**MEANING Meaning:** Has one level of meaning; theme is obvious and revealed early in the text.

**Meaning:** Has multiple levels of meaning clearly distinguished from each other; theme is clear but

may be conveyed with some subtlety.

**Meaning:** Has multiple levels of meaning that may be difficult to identify or

separate; theme is implicit or subtle and may be revealed over the entirety of the text.

**Meaning:** Has multiple competing levels of meaning that are difficult to identify, separate, and interpret; theme is implicit or subtle, often ambiguous and revealed over the entirety of the text.
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checklist for evaluating question quality

Checklist for Evaluating Question Quality

The second advance in college and career readiness standards is “reading, writing, and speaking grounded in evidence from text.” This resource can serve as a quality check on the alignment

of questions that require students to present careful analyses, well-defended claims, and clear information on the text they read.5

Lessons Under Review (include page numbers):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Comments/Questions/Fixes**  **(refer to specific questions!)** |
| **A. Text-Dependent Questions** | |
| A1. Does the student have to read the text to  answer each question? |  |
| A2. Is it always clear to students that answering each question requires using evidence from the text to support their claims? (Reading Standard 1 should always be in play!) |  |
| **B. Text-Specific Questions** | |
| B1. Are the questions specific enough so they can be answered only by reference to this text? (Can they be answered with careful reading rather than background knowledge?) |  |
| B2. Are the questions tied to level-specific standards? |  |

5 Adapted from *Checklist for Evaluating Question Quality* from Student Achievement Partners. [http://achievethecore.org/page/47/](http://achievethecore.org/page/47/checklist-for-evaluating-question-quality)

[checklist-for-evaluating-question-quality](http://achievethecore.org/page/47/checklist-for-evaluating-question-quality)

Adapted for TCSG Adult Education from College and Career Readiness Standards-in-Action |  **13** |

checklist for evaluating question quality

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Comments/Questions/Fixes**  **(refer to specific questions!)** |
| **C. Sequence of Questions That Build Knowledge** | |
| C1. Do the early questions in the sequence focus on specific phrases and sentences to support basic comprehension of the text and develop student confidence before moving on to more challenging tasks? |  |
| C2. Are the questions coherently sequenced? Do they build toward gradual understanding of the text’s meaning? |  |
| C3. Do the questions stay focused on the text and go beyond it to make other connections in extension activities only *after* the text has been explored? |  |
| C4. If multiple texts/different media are under consideration, are students asked to examine each text closely before making connections between texts? |  |
| **D. Well-Constructed Culminating Task or Writing Prompts** | |
| D1. Does the culminating task or writing prompt(s) call on the knowledge and understanding acquired through the questions? |  |
| D2. Does the culminating task or writing prompt(s) demand that students write to the text and use evidence? |  |
| D3. Are the instructions to teachers and students clear about what must be performed to achieve proficiency? |  |
| D4. Is this a writing task worthy of the  student and classroom time it will consume? |  |
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