NGSS EQuIP Rubric Changes

Overall changes:

- The term column was changed to category because column was confusing when looking at the response form section of the document.
- A lettering system was added so that criteria could be referenced more easily. This new system is used below to indicate which criterion was changed. The notation below takes the form of: Category: Roman Numeral. Criterion: Letter. Sub-Criterion: Roman Numeral. For example, the first sub-criterion under the first criterion under the first category (Alignment to the NGSS) would be I.A.i.
- And/or was added to the phrase make sense of phenomena or design solutions as sometimes both making sense of phenomena and designing solutions to problems are being done in a lesson or unit.
- The phrase design solutions was changed to design solutions to problems. This was done to make the phrase parallel to the make sense of phenomena phrase.
- A fourth goal was added to the goals of the rubric. The newly stated goal of the rubric is: to inform the development of new lessons and units.
- Definitions of the terms lesson and unit were added.
- The phrase a unit or longer lesson was changed to a unit or longer lesson will also to make it clear that these are additional criteria for units and longer lessons.
- The term blend was deleted from the phrase blend and work together. Some users found these words redundant and others felt the blend implied that the three-dimensions became one thing when, in fact, the three-dimensions remain separate pieces that simply work together.
- The title of the second column in the response form was changed from Specific evidence from materials under review to Specific evidence from materials and reviewers’ reasoning to acknowledge that reviewers not only cite evidence in this column but explain why they believe that evidence does or does not meet the criteria.

Specific rubric changes:

- I.A. The term grade-appropriate was added before elements to clarify that elements should come from the particular grade or grade-band of the lesson or unit being reviewed. It is of course fine to use additional elements from grade-bands other than the one of the lesson or unit being reviewed, but for the purposes of determining alignment, it is expected that grade-level appropriate elements are being used.
- I.A.i.–I.A.iii. The term to develop was added to I.A.i. to clarify that the practices are something to be learned and not just used. To make the other sub-criterion consistent with this one, they were changed from construct and use to develop and use.
- I.A.iv. This sub-criterion was added to ensure rubric users consider whether the three-dimensions are not only present, but more importantly, if they are working together.
- I.B. This criterion was broken down to make some of the original criteria into sub-criteria. This was done to help define what is meant by coherence.
- I.C and I.D. These criteria were originally only one criterion. Rubric users thought having them together with an and/or was confusing and included too much for one criterion. Splitting them
also gave the writers an opportunity to make them clearer and provide a purpose for making interdisciplinary connections, to explain phenomena.

- **II.A.** Two sub-criteria were added (II.A.i. and II.A.iv.) to better describe what was intended by the overarching criterion.
  - **II.A.ii.** It was determined that it is not always necessary to have multiple phenomena, but that there is at least one relevant phenomenon or problem that students are asked to make sense of or solve, and that students connect the phenomenon or problem at hand with another phenomenon, problem, or experience they with which familiar. These ideas are captured in the edit of II.A.ii. and the addition of II.A.iv.
- **II.E.** Some minor edits were made to avoid overuse of the words *provide* and *providing.*
  - **II.E.ii.** The word *modification* is associated with changing the expectation for a student. The intention here was not to change student expectations, but to provide supports such as translations, graphic organizers, etc. Therefore *modifications* was replaced with *alternatives*.
  - **II.E.iv.** The phrase *to develop deep understanding of the practice, disciplinary core ideas, and crosscutting concepts* replaced the phrase *consistent with learning progressions* to be consistent with the rest of the document which uses the language of the NGSS and focuses on the three-dimensions.
- **II.G.** It was noted that there was nothing about removing supports over time as there is in the EQuIP rubric for mathematics and ELA. This bullet was added to address providing supports to help students engage in practices and to adjust the supports over time.
- **III.A.** Two criteria were combined as they were seen as similar – pieces from each are represented in the new criterion.