**Revisions to EQuIP Rubric for Lessons & Units: Science**

**From version 3.0 to version 3.1:**

Based on new understanding in the field of the importance of language framing to honor and respect the assets of all students, one of the sub-criteria of version 3.0 of the EQuIP rubric was updated. The intent and meaning of this criterion was not altered, and the wording changes do not add or remove any expectations. A full revision to the EQuIP rubric was not undertaken at this time, so no other criteria were changed.

**Language Change to Clarify Meaning of Criteria**

**Category II:** **NGSS Instructional Supports**

**II.E. Differentiated Instruction.**

The language of the first sub-criterion (i) was updated to remove deficit-based framing (e.g., English learners changed to multilingual learners). The resulting sub-criterion language is as follows:

“Supportive ways to access instruction, including appropriate linguistic, visual, and kinesthetic engagement opportunities that are essential for effective science and engineering learning and particularly beneficial for multilingual learners and students with disabilities”

**From version 2.0 to version 3.0:**

Feedback from the thousands of educators using the rubric across the United States over the last two years to evaluate lessons combined with feedback from those leading professional learning using the rubric led to the changes that are described below. These changes were made with thoughtful deliberation by the same group that authored version 2.0. Many thanks to those that asked questions and provided feedback on version 2.0, the variety of groups that provided focused feedback on the variations of version 3.0 over the final six months of its development, and the writing group for all of the time, effort and energy they put into this revision.

**Formatting/Language Changes**

1. Scoring guides were added to the response form of the rubric (pages 6—14) to facilitate evaluation of the overall quality and NGSS design of materials.
2. Shift from “alignment” language to “design” language.
Version 3.0 includes a deliberate change in language from talking about lesson “alignment” to evaluating NGSS “design.” Though it was never the intent of the rubric, “alignment” has too frequently come to mean just having the pieces or parts of the standards in some way connected to the lesson. In contrast, to really capture the vision of the Framework embodied in the NGSS takes more than just the pieces and parts—it takes thoughtful design. This might mean starting from scratch and building new materials and it might mean starting with existing materials and significantly reworking them, but the focus either way is ensuring the innovations of the standards are designed into the materials.
3. The names for Category I, II, and III have been changed to reflect that all of the categories are about NGSS Design and not just the first category.
4. Each of the criteria has been given a name to support conversations during the EQuIP quality review process.
5. The language in the intro and the directions sections was modified to accommodate the changes that were made to the rubric and to include hyperlinks to relevant support documents.
6. New introductory sentences were added at the top of each category in the rubric to clarify the collective evaluative goal of the criteria in the category.

**Organizational Changes to accommodate clearer scoring and clarify meaning of criteria**

**Category I**: **NGSS 3D Design**

1. Category I, Criterion A from version 2.0 was split into three criteria—A, B and C—to highlight the importance of these essential components of NGSS design.
	1. **I.A.** **Explaining Phenomena/Designing Solutions.** One of the key ways that designing lessons and units for the NGSS is different than just looking for the pieces and parts of the standards is the necessary focus on students making sense of phenomena and or designing solutions to problems. This was included as a sub-criterion of Criterion A in version 2.0, but it has been raised to the level of a criterion in this version. In doing so, several other sub-criteria from other places in the rubric were brought together so that the phenomenon or design problem is evaluated primarily in one place on the rubric.
	2. **I.B.** **Three Dimensions.** This Criterion focuses on whether grade appropriate elements of the three dimensions are being used in the lesson to help students make sense of phenomena, or design solutions to problems. It is basically what were the first three sub-criteria from I.A. in version 2.0—looking for evidence of elements of each of the three dimensions—with a clarified focus that these elements of the three dimensions are supportive of the sense making or problem solving processes.
	3. **I.C.** **Integrating the Three Dimensions.** In version 2.0, the fourth sub-criterion of I.A. highlighted the importance of the three dimensions working together. In version 3.0, this concept is elevated to the level of a criterion.

Reorganizing Category I not only ensured that key components of NGSS 3D Design will be thoroughly evaluated by the rubric, but it also made the rating scales more parallel across the three categories of the rubric.

1. In the unit section for category I, the primary change was to combine two related criteria—what used to be I.C and I.D in version 2.0—into one criterion, **I.E. Multiple Science Domains**, with each of the former criteria now represented as sub-criteria. The wording for the second sub-criterion (I.E.ii) was modified to emphasize the importance of using the crosscutting concepts as a lens for interpreting phenomena and designing solutions to problems across science domains instead of just focusing on “connecting” the disciplines.

**Category II:** **NGSS Instructional Supports**

Most of the changes in Category II are related to those that were made in Category I. For example, sub-criteria from II.A and II.E that were related to phenomena are now represented in **I.A.** **Explaining Phenomena/Designing Solutions.** However, there were also a few other changes:

1. **II.A. Relevance and Authenticity.** The prior language about the purpose for learning moved to I.A; now, this criterion focuses on instructional supports for relevant and authentic learning experiences for students. Accordingly, the sub-criterion that was previously II.E.i. in version 2.0 was moved to II.A**.**
2. **II.B. Student Ideas.** With the emphasis on explaining phenomena and solution design, this criterion was moved up from II.D to emphasize the importance of students sharing their ideas about phenomena or solutions to a problem
3. **II.C. Building Progressions.** The language of this criterion was revised to emphasize instructional supports for teachers that clearly identify prior learning expected for all three dimensions and how this lesson or unit builds on that prior student learning.
4. **II.F. Teacher Support for Unit Coherence. T**his criterion was expanded to explain in more detail the types of instructional support expected to ensure the teacher can establish a learning context that provides a need to engage in learning from the student’s perspective.

**Category III: Monitoring NGSS Student Progress**

There were very few changes in this category. Other than the titles for the criteria being added as they were in all categories, there were some minor language tweaks for clarity in III.A and III.C.