

THE WRITING ACADEMY®, LLC

Range Performance Level Descriptors

TEKS Thinking-Level Instructional Report

Composition, Genres, Inquiry and Research, and Response Skills
TEKS 7, 11, 12, and 13 • Grade 3 English Language Arts and Reading



PREPARED BY

RANDI WHITNEY

The Writing Academy®, LLC

© 2026 The Writing Academy®, LLC. All rights reserved.

No part of this document may be reproduced, distributed, or
transmitted
in any form or by any means without prior written permission.

Grade 3 English Language Arts and Reading
Aligned to 19 TAC Chapter 110, Subchapter A, §110.5

Table of Contents

How to Read the Range PLD Charts	4
TEKS 7: Response Skills	5
TEKS 11: Writing Process	13
TEKS 12: Genres	31
TEKS 13: Inquiry and Research	37

How to Read the Range PLD Charts

Each TEKS is described across five performance ranges. The placement decision should be based on the preponderance of evidence across a student response, work sample, conference, or set of related items.

Instructional Decision Rule

- If evidence falls between two levels, place the student at the lower level until the higher-level behavior is demonstrated consistently and independently.
- Use the "Instructional adjustment" column as the immediate next-step response: model, scaffold, release, extend.
- A student may be at different thinking levels for different TEKS. The purpose is a profile of strengths and needs, not a single global label.

Thinking Levels at a Glance

Thinking Level	Paired Range	Shape	Instructional Interpretation
Foundational	Beginning	●	Requires direct modeling and substantial support; skill is absent, fragmented, or not yet transferable.
Emergent	Developing	■	Demonstrates partial understanding with prompts; performance is inconsistent or dependent on familiar conditions.
Visible	Engaging	▼	Shows observable control in familiar tasks; grade-level thinking is emerging clearly but may weaken with complexity.
Independent	Independent	▲	Applies the skill accurately, consistently, and independently across the expected task.
Reflective	Highly Independent	◆	Uses the skill strategically, transfers it to new contexts, self-monitors, and can explain or defend choices.

Instructional Purpose

To interpret what student work reveals about thinking, not merely whether an answer is right or wrong, and to connect each performance range to the next most appropriate instructional move.

TEKS 7

Response Skills

TEKS 7, Response Skills

7(A) Describe personal connections to a variety of sources

TEKS expectation: describe personal connections to a variety of sources, including self-selected texts;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Names the text or source but does not connect it to personal experience, prior knowledge, or other texts. Connections, if attempted, are off-topic or generic. Thinking revealed: The student treats the source as isolated information rather than something to connect with personal understanding.	Model connection-making with think-alouds using "This reminds me of..." and "I have experienced..." stems. Use familiar, high-interest texts and ask students to sort connections as text-to-self, text-to-text, or text-to-world before writing.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Makes a basic personal connection to the source but the connection may be superficial, tangential, or explained in only one sentence. May rely on a single connection type. Thinking revealed: The student understands that readers connect sources to their own lives but does not yet develop or explain the connection meaningfully.	Provide sentence frames that extend beyond naming a connection: "This connects to my experience because..." and "This changed my thinking about..." Require at least two sentences and confer to deepen the explanation.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Describes a relevant personal connection and provides some explanation of how the connection deepens understanding of the source. Uses more than one connection type across tasks. Thinking revealed: The student can articulate why a connection matters, not just that one exists. Thinking is functional in familiar reading contexts.	Reduce frames and ask students to choose which type of connection is most meaningful for a given source and explain why. Include self-selected texts to build genuine engagement.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently describes specific, well-explained personal connections across a variety of sources, including self-selected texts. Connections clearly show how the source relates to experience, knowledge, or other reading. Thinking revealed: The student uses personal connections as a comprehension strategy, not just a response task.	Emphasize transfer across genres and self-selected texts. Ask students to compare the quality of different connections and select the one that most deepens understanding.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Makes layered, reflective connections that integrate personal experience, prior reading, and world knowledge. Can explain how connecting strengthens comprehension and can evaluate which connections are most productive. Thinking revealed: The student monitors and evaluates the connection process, choosing strategically among connection types.	Extend through open-ended response journals, cross-text comparison, and reflection on how personal connections shift as understanding deepens across multiple sources.

TEKS 7, Response Skills

7(B) Write a response to a literary or informational text

TEKS expectation: write a response to a literary or informational text that demonstrates an understanding of a text;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Writes a minimal or off-topic response that does not clearly address the text. The response may retell isolated details or copy text without demonstrating comprehension. Thinking revealed: The student has not yet moved beyond surface contact with the text. Written response does not reflect understanding of meaning.	Use oral rehearsal before writing. Ask "What is this text mostly about?" and "What did you learn or notice?" Model a short written response from a think-aloud, then have the student write one key idea in a complete sentence.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Writes a response that shows partial understanding of the text. May identify a main idea or key detail but the response is underdeveloped, loosely connected, or relies heavily on retelling. Thinking revealed: The student is beginning to distinguish retelling from responding but does not yet explain or interpret the text.	Provide response stems that move beyond retelling: "The author is showing that..." and "This is important because..." Require the response to include at least one idea and one supporting detail from the text.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Writes a focused response that demonstrates understanding of the text's main idea or theme. Includes relevant details and some explanation, though depth or precision may vary. Thinking revealed: The student can identify and communicate what the text means and support that understanding with evidence from the text.	Ask students to reread their response and check whether it answers a focus question. Strengthen elaboration by asking "Why does this matter in the text?" and requiring students to connect evidence to their central point.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently writes a clear, well-organized response that demonstrates solid understanding of a literary or informational text. Uses specific text details and explains how they support the response. Thinking revealed: The student treats the response as an opportunity to demonstrate and communicate comprehension, not just complete a task.	Increase text complexity and vary response demands. Ask students to respond to texts they have not previously discussed and to choose which aspects of the text to address.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Writes a nuanced, well-developed response that demonstrates deep understanding. Integrates multiple text details, draws inferences, and may connect ideas across parts of the text or across texts. Thinking revealed: The student uses writing as a tool for thinking about text, not just reporting on it. The response reflects synthesis and critical engagement.	Extend with comparative responses across texts, open-ended analytical prompts, and reflection on how writing about a text deepens understanding.

TEKS 7, Response Skills

7(C) Use text evidence to support an appropriate response

TEKS expectation: use text evidence to support an appropriate response;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Does not include text evidence, or evidence is copied without connection to a claim or response. The student may quote or cite text but not explain its relevance. Thinking revealed: The student does not yet understand that evidence must be selected and connected to a point.	Model selecting one piece of evidence and explaining how it supports an idea. Use a simple claim + evidence + explanation frame. Practice orally before writing.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Includes some text evidence but it may be loosely connected to the response, generic, or presented without explanation. May use evidence that partially supports the point. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes that responses need evidence but does not yet select or explain evidence strategically.	Use "Does this evidence prove my point?" as an editing question. Provide practice matching evidence to claims and require at least one sentence of explanation after each piece of evidence.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Selects relevant text evidence and connects it to the response with some explanation. Evidence generally supports the point, though explanation may be brief or uneven. Thinking revealed: The student can locate and use evidence purposefully in familiar response tasks. The connection between evidence and claim is functional.	Ask students to evaluate whether their evidence is the strongest available. Practice replacing weak evidence with stronger evidence and deepening the explanation.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently selects specific, relevant text evidence and clearly explains how it supports the response. Evidence is well-integrated and the explanation demonstrates understanding. Thinking revealed: The student uses evidence as a tool for building and supporting meaning, not just fulfilling a requirement.	Increase text complexity and require students to use multiple pieces of evidence. Ask students to explain why one piece of evidence is stronger than another for a given claim.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Strategically selects and layers text evidence, explains connections thoroughly, and evaluates the strength or sufficiency of evidence. May synthesize evidence from multiple parts of a text. Thinking revealed: The student treats evidence selection and explanation as a thinking process, evaluating relevance, strength, and sufficiency.	Extend with tasks requiring evidence evaluation, counterevidence consideration, and reflection on how evidence selection shapes the quality of a response.

TEKS 7, Response Skills

7(D) Retell and paraphrase texts

TEKS expectation: retell and paraphrase texts in ways that maintain meaning and logical order;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Retells random or disconnected details, copies wording from the source, or changes the meaning of the original text. Logical order is not maintained. Thinking revealed: The student has not yet distinguished retelling from copying and does not control the sequence or meaning of the original.	Model retelling with sequencing cards, beginning/middle/end frames, and oral rehearsal. Use short, familiar texts and ask the student to retell before writing.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Retells key events or ideas in a mostly logical order but may omit important information, add inaccurate details, or rely heavily on the original wording. Thinking revealed: The student understands the purpose of retelling but does not yet consistently maintain meaning and sequence independently.	Use a checklist: Did I include the most important parts? Is the order correct? Did I use my own words? Practice paraphrasing one sentence at a time, then expand to short passages.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Retells or paraphrases the text in a logical order that maintains the original meaning. Most key ideas and events are included, and the student uses substantially original wording. Thinking revealed: The student can process and reorganize text information while preserving meaning. Paraphrasing is functional in familiar contexts.	Ask students to compare their retelling to the original for accuracy and completeness. Practice paraphrasing increasingly complex passages and noting where meaning might shift.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently retells and paraphrases texts accurately, maintaining meaning and logical order. Captures key ideas, omits minor details appropriately, and uses original language throughout. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates control over both the content and the language of the retelling, treating it as a comprehension task.	Shift to longer and more complex texts. Ask students to retell for different purposes or audiences and to evaluate whether their retelling captures the essential meaning.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Retells and paraphrases with precision, maintaining nuance, emphasis, and logical order. Can adjust the retelling for different audiences or purposes and explain choices about what to include or omit. Thinking revealed: The student monitors the retelling process strategically, making deliberate decisions about emphasis, detail, and language.	Extend with multi-text retelling, summary versus retelling comparisons, and reflection on how audience and purpose shape what is included in a paraphrase.

TEKS 7, Response Skills

7(E) Interact with sources in meaningful ways

TEKS expectation: interact with sources in meaningful ways such as notetaking, annotating, freewriting, or illustrating;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Does not interact with the source beyond reading it, or interactions are random marks, copied words, or drawings unrelated to meaning. Thinking revealed: The student does not yet recognize that active interaction with a source supports comprehension.	Model one interaction strategy at a time. Use think-alouds to show how annotating, notetaking, or sketching helps a reader understand and remember. Start with short, high-interest texts.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses one familiar interaction strategy with prompting but interactions may be surface-level, such as underlining everything or copying phrases without explanation. Thinking revealed: The student understands that readers should do something while reading but does not yet use interaction strategies to deepen understanding.	Provide purpose-driven prompts: "Mark one thing that surprised you and write why." Teach the difference between marking everything and marking what matters. Require a brief written explanation alongside each annotation or note.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses notetaking, annotating, freewriting, or illustrating to capture key ideas and reactions. Interactions are mostly purposeful and connected to meaning. Thinking revealed: The student can use interaction strategies to support comprehension in familiar reading situations.	Ask students to choose which strategy fits a particular text or purpose. Compare the usefulness of different strategies and have students explain why they chose one approach over another.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently selects and uses appropriate interaction strategies across a variety of sources. Notes, annotations, or other interactions reflect genuine engagement with the text's meaning. Thinking revealed: The student treats source interaction as a comprehension tool, not just a compliance task.	Emphasize transfer across content areas and self-selected texts. Ask students to review their notes or annotations and use them as the basis for a response or discussion.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Strategically combines or adapts interaction methods to match the demands of the source. Can explain how different strategies serve different purposes and evaluates which interactions were most productive. Thinking revealed: The student monitors and adjusts interaction strategies based on the text and the task, making metacognitive choices about how to engage.	Extend with multi-source notetaking, strategy comparison tasks, and reflection on how interaction choices affect the quality of understanding and response.

TEKS 7, Response Skills

7(F) Respond using newly acquired vocabulary

TEKS expectation: respond using newly acquired vocabulary as appropriate;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Does not use new vocabulary from the source in the response, or uses new words incorrectly or out of context. Thinking revealed: The student does not yet recognize that responses are an opportunity to apply and practice new vocabulary.	Identify two or three key vocabulary words before or during reading. Model using one in a response sentence. Have the student practice orally, then write a sentence using the word in context.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Attempts to use one or two newly acquired words but usage may be awkward, imprecise, or forced. The word may appear without clear connection to the response's meaning. Thinking revealed: The student understands that new words should appear in responses but does not yet control their meaning or placement.	Use word walls, vocabulary journals, and sentence frames. Ask students to explain the word's meaning before using it and to check whether it fits the context of their response.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses newly acquired vocabulary appropriately in most responses. Words are used in context and generally enhance the precision or clarity of the response. Thinking revealed: The student can integrate new vocabulary into written responses when the context is familiar and supportive.	Ask students to choose the most effective vocabulary word for a particular response and explain why. Practice replacing vague words with precise, newly acquired terms.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently and accurately uses newly acquired vocabulary across responses to literary and informational texts. Word choices enhance meaning and demonstrate growing command of academic and domain-specific language. Thinking revealed: The student treats vocabulary use as a tool for precision and clarity, not just a task requirement.	Increase the complexity of expected vocabulary and require students to use words across contexts. Ask students to evaluate whether a vocabulary choice strengthens or weakens a response.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Selects and uses newly acquired vocabulary strategically, choosing words for their precision, register, or effect. Can explain why a particular word is the best choice and may use vocabulary to draw connections across texts. Thinking revealed: The student monitors word choice as part of the composing and revision process, making deliberate decisions about vocabulary.	Extend with vocabulary analysis tasks, synonym comparison, register awareness, and reflection on how word choice shapes the reader's understanding of a response.

TEKS 7, Response Skills

7(G) Discuss specific ideas in the text

TEKS expectation: discuss specific ideas in the text that are important to the meaning;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Identifies a topic or names the text but does not discuss specific ideas important to the meaning. May offer a personal opinion without reference to the text's content. Thinking revealed: The student does not yet distinguish between naming a topic and discussing specific ideas that carry the text's meaning.	Model identifying one important idea in a short text and explaining why it matters to the meaning. Use "The author wants the reader to understand that..." as a starting frame. Practice with oral discussion before writing.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Identifies one or two ideas from the text but discussion is surface-level or does not explain why the ideas are important to the meaning. May confuse minor details with central ideas. Thinking revealed: The student can locate ideas in a text but does not yet evaluate their importance or connect them to overall meaning.	Use a ranking activity: list three ideas from the text and ask which is most important to the meaning and why. Require students to explain the connection between the idea and the text's central message or purpose.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Discusses specific ideas from the text and explains their importance to the meaning with some detail. Most ideas identified are genuinely central to the text. Thinking revealed: The student can distinguish important ideas from minor details and can explain how those ideas contribute to the text's overall meaning.	Ask students to identify the most important idea in a text and defend their choice with evidence. Practice comparing two ideas and evaluating which one is more central to the meaning.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently identifies and discusses specific, central ideas from the text with clear explanations of their importance. Connects ideas to the text's purpose, theme, or central message. Thinking revealed: The student uses idea identification as a comprehension and analysis tool, engaging with the text's deeper meaning.	Increase text complexity and ask students to trace how a specific idea develops across a text. Require discussion of why the author chose to emphasize certain ideas over others.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Discusses multiple specific ideas, explains their relationships, and evaluates their importance to the text's overall meaning. May connect ideas across sections or across texts and explain how they shape interpretation. Thinking revealed: The student analyzes the role of specific ideas within the larger architecture of the text, making interpretive and evaluative judgments.	Extend with cross-text idea analysis, thematic comparison, and reflection on how different readers might prioritize different ideas based on purpose or perspective.

TEKS 11

Writing Process

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(A) Plan a first draft

TEKS expectation: plan a first draft by selecting a genre for a particular topic, purpose, and audience using a range of strategies such as brainstorming, freewriting, and mapping;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Begins writing with little or no usable plan. The plan may be a random list, copied wording, or ideas that do not match the selected genre, purpose, or audience. Thinking revealed: The student is reacting to the task rather than intentionally planning. The response shows limited recognition that genre, audience, and purpose should shape what is written.	Model one planning strategy at a time. Use think-alouds to connect topic → purpose → audience → genre, then have the student sort relevant and irrelevant planning notes before drafting.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Identifies the topic and may select an appropriate genre, but the plan is incomplete or requires prompting. Uses one familiar strategy, while purpose and audience are only partly reflected. Thinking revealed: The student understands that planning comes before drafting, but is not yet coordinating all planning variables. Thinking is partial and inconsistent.	Provide a structured planner with explicit prompts for topic, purpose, audience, genre, and key ideas. Confer briefly before drafting and require the student to explain one planning choice.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Creates a usable plan with mostly relevant ideas and selects a reasonable genre and strategy. Purpose and audience are visible, although sequencing, prioritizing, or elaboration may still be uneven. Thinking revealed: The student can make the planning process visible and can connect several task demands. Thinking is organized enough to support a successful first draft in familiar situations.	Reduce scaffolds. Ask the student to choose between two or more planning strategies, prioritize ideas, and add notes explaining how selected details will serve the intended audience.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently selects an appropriate genre and planning strategy based on topic, purpose, and audience. The plan anticipates structure, key ideas, and useful details before drafting begins. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates coordinated, purposeful planning and can translate task analysis into an organized blueprint for writing.	Move from teacher-selected tools to student-selected tools. Emphasize efficient planning, flexible revision of the plan, and transfer across unfamiliar prompts and genres.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Selects, combines, or adapts planning strategies strategically. Revises the plan as new ideas emerge and can explain how planning decisions will influence organization, voice, evidence, or reader impact. Thinking revealed: The student monitors the planning process, evaluates alternatives, and makes metacognitive decisions rather than simply completing a planner.	Extend through open-ended prompts, multiple audiences, and planning conferences in which the student defends choices, compares strategies, and identifies when the plan itself should change.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(B)(i) Organize with purposeful structure

TEKS expectation: organizing with purposeful structure, including an introduction and a conclusion;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Ideas appear in a random or list-like order. An introduction or conclusion may be missing, copied, or unrelated to the body of the piece. Thinking revealed: The student is producing information or events without controlling the reader's path through the writing.	Use physical sequencing activities, color-coded beginning/middle/end or introduction/body/conclusion models, and sentence strips. Rebuild a model text before asking the student to restructure a draft.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Shows a recognizable beginning and ending, but one may be generic or disconnected. The middle has some order, yet ideas may jump, repeat, or cluster unevenly. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes basic text architecture but does not yet use structure consistently to support focus and coherence.	Provide paragraph or section frames and transition banks. Ask the student to label the job of each section and move one misplaced idea to a more purposeful location.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses a clear introduction, logical middle structure, and conclusion. Organization generally supports meaning, though transitions, balance, or emphasis may become uneven as the piece grows more complex. Thinking revealed: The student's organizational thinking is visible and functional; the response shows control of structure in familiar writing tasks.	Shift from frames to outline checks. Have the student justify sequence choices, strengthen transitions, and revise one section for better balance or emphasis.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently organizes ideas with a purposeful structure. The introduction establishes direction, the body develops it coherently, and the conclusion provides an appropriate sense of closure. Thinking revealed: The student consistently uses structure as a tool for clarity rather than merely including required parts.	Increase task complexity and vary organizational demands. Ask students to choose among chronological, categorical, cause/effect, problem/solution, or other structures when appropriate.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Manipulates structure intentionally to strengthen meaning, pacing, emphasis, or reader engagement. Can explain why one organizational choice is more effective than another. Thinking revealed: The student evaluates structure from the reader's perspective and revises globally when the architecture of the piece can be improved.	Use mentor-text comparisons and structural revision challenges. Require students to test alternate openings, endings, or sequences and articulate the effect of each choice.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(B)(ii) Develop an engaging idea with relevant details

TEKS expectation: developing an engaging idea with relevant details;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: The main idea, focus, or storyline is unclear. Details are sparse, unrelated, copied, or too general to develop the writing. Thinking revealed: The student has not yet distinguished the central idea from supporting information.	Teach “main idea versus detail” explicitly. Use sorting, oral rehearsal, and a small number of teacher-provided details before asking the student to generate relevant details independently.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: A central idea or storyline is present, and some details relate to it, but development is thin, repetitive, or mixed with off-topic information. Thinking revealed: The student can identify what the writing is about but is still learning which details deepen the reader’s understanding.	Use relevance checks such as “Does this detail prove, show, explain, or develop the idea?” Prompt for one specific example, action, fact, image, or explanation at a time.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Develops a clear and generally engaging idea with mostly relevant details. Some portions are well developed while others remain general or uneven. Thinking revealed: The response shows visible selection of details and growing awareness that elaboration must serve the central idea.	Ask the student to rank details by strength, replace generic details with specific ones, and identify one place where the reader still needs more information.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Sustains a focused, engaging idea and selects specific, relevant details that develop it throughout the piece. Thinking revealed: The student consistently evaluates details for relevance and uses them to deepen meaning rather than merely lengthen the response.	Emphasize precision, purposeful elaboration, and independence. Use revision conferences that ask why each detail is present and what it contributes.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Layers carefully selected details to create depth, nuance, voice, or emphasis. Removes technically relevant details when they dilute the intended effect. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates strategic selection and can evaluate the relative value of details from the reader’s perspective.	Extend with synthesis, compression, and craft challenges. Ask students to develop the same idea for different audiences or effects and defend their detail choices.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(C) Revise for coherence and clarity

TEKS expectation: revise drafts to improve sentence structure and word choice by adding, deleting, combining, and rearranging ideas for coherence and clarity;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Makes few meaningful revisions or treats revision as correcting spelling, handwriting, or punctuation. Changes may not improve the message. Thinking revealed: The student does not yet distinguish revision of ideas and sentences from editing of conventions.	Teach revision versus editing with side-by-side examples. Model one operation at a time, add, delete, combine, rearrange, and ask the student to explain how the change improves meaning.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Makes isolated revisions when prompted, often using one familiar operation such as adding a detail or replacing a word. The effect on clarity is inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student understands that a draft can change but still relies on external cues to identify what and why to revise.	Use targeted revision prompts and before/after comparisons. Require at least two different revision operations and a short reason for each change.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses several revision operations to improve sentences or ideas. Most changes increase clarity, but revision may focus on local spots rather than the coherence of the whole piece. Thinking revealed: The student can see and repair visible problems and is beginning to connect revision decisions to reader understanding.	Move to paragraph-level revision. Have the student trace idea flow, combine choppy sentences, rearrange one section, and replace vague wording with precise language.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently revises sentence structure and word choice using adding, deleting, combining, and rearranging as needed to strengthen coherence and clarity. Thinking revealed: The student reads the draft as a reviser, identifies weaknesses, and selects an appropriate revision tool without waiting for a teacher cue.	Use less directive feedback and more outcome-based goals such as “make this clearer” or “improve flow.” Ask students to choose and justify the revision method.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Revises strategically across sentences, paragraphs, and the whole composition. Tests alternatives, preserves voice, and can explain how changes alter clarity, emphasis, rhythm, or coherence. Thinking revealed: The student monitors the text from the reader’s perspective and uses revision as problem solving and craft, not merely correction.	Extend through authentic editing workshops, multiple revision passes with different lenses, and comparison of alternate revisions for effect and efficiency.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(i) Complete simple and compound sentences; subject-verb agreement

TEKS expectation: complete simple and compound sentences with subject-verb agreement;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Frequently writes fragments, run-ons, or incomplete thoughts. Subject-verb agreement errors interfere with readability, and the student may not reliably identify a complete sentence. Thinking revealed: The student is still constructing the concept of a sentence and the relationship between the subject and verb.	Return to oral sentence building, subject/verb matching, and sentence-versus-fragment sorting. Use short controlled practice before applying the skill in a draft.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Writes many complete simple sentences and attempts compound sentences, but agreement and boundary errors remain inconsistent, especially with longer subjects or joined clauses. Thinking revealed: The student has partial control of sentence completeness and agreement but is not yet transferring the rule reliably during composition.	Use sentence combining with color-coded subjects and verbs. Provide targeted editing practice on one error pattern, then require immediate transfer into the student's own writing.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Writes mostly complete simple and compound sentences with generally correct subject-verb agreement. Errors may appear with compound subjects, intervening phrases, or longer sentences. Thinking revealed: The student's grammatical thinking is visible and usually accurate in familiar constructions, but complexity can overload monitoring.	Use error analysis and increasingly complex sentence patterns. Ask the student to mark subjects/verbs only when a sentence "sounds questionable" rather than on every sentence.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Consistently writes and edits complete simple and compound sentences with correct subject-verb agreement across a composition. Thinking revealed: The student independently monitors sentence boundaries and grammatical relationships while maintaining meaning.	Shift instruction toward sentence variety, fluency, and efficient self-editing rather than reteaching the basic rule.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Varies simple and compound sentence structures intentionally for pace, emphasis, or style and accurately handles challenging agreement patterns. Can explain why a form is correct. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates grammatical control plus metalinguistic awareness; conventions are serving craft.	Extend with mentor-sentence imitation, intentional sentence combining, and editing of authentic complex examples in which students defend grammatical choices.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(ii) Past, present, and future verb tense

TEKS expectation: past, present, and future verb tense;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Verb tense is missing, confused, or shifts unpredictably. The timeline of events or ideas can be difficult to follow. Thinking revealed: The student has limited control of how verb forms signal time.	Use oral timelines, time words, and sentence sorting for past/present/future. Keep the linguistic load small and connect each tense to a visible time reference.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses basic past, present, or future forms correctly in some sentences but shifts tense unintentionally or struggles with irregular verbs. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes tense categories but does not yet monitor consistency across connected sentences.	Have students highlight verbs in a short paragraph, identify the intended timeline, and repair only the inconsistent verbs. Practice common irregular forms in context.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses past, present, and future tense accurately in familiar contexts with occasional unintended shifts, especially as the composition becomes longer or more complex. Thinking revealed: The student can sustain a timeline for much of the response and usually notices obvious tense mismatches.	Reduce isolated worksheets. Use paragraph-level editing and ask students to explain whether each shift is intentional or accidental.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Uses verb tense consistently and intentionally to match time, meaning, and genre; independently edits accidental tense shifts. Thinking revealed: The student coordinates tense with the composition's timeline without sacrificing content generation.	Focus on transfer across narratives, informational explanations, and correspondence. Introduce purposeful tense shifts and ask students to justify them.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Manipulates tense deliberately when needed for flashback, explanation, commentary, or comparison and can explain the effect on the reader's understanding of time. Thinking revealed: The student views tense as both a convention and a meaning-making choice.	Extend through authentic passages with deliberate shifts, nuanced timelines, and revision tasks where tense choices change perspective or emphasis.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(iii) Singular, plural, common, and proper nouns

TEKS expectation: singular, plural, common, and proper nouns;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Uses nouns inconsistently or confuses singular/plural and common/proper forms. Capitalization and plural formation errors are frequent. Thinking revealed: The student is still developing the categories and patterns that distinguish noun types and number.	Use concrete sorting, noun hunts, and oral-to-written transformations: one/more than one and general/specific name. Practice a few plural patterns at a time.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Correctly uses familiar noun forms but makes errors with irregular plurals, proper noun capitalization, or switching between singular and plural references. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes the categories but applies them inconsistently during authentic writing.	Use short editing sets tied to the student's own draft. Ask the student to label the noun type only when correcting an error and to explain the clue used.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses singular, plural, common, and proper nouns correctly in most writing. Errors occur mainly with less familiar irregular forms or complex names. Thinking revealed: The response shows functional control and growing self-monitoring of noun form and capitalization.	Increase variety of noun forms and have students replace vague nouns with precise nouns. Add proofreading for number consistency and naming conventions.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Consistently uses and edits noun forms accurately, including appropriate capitalization of proper nouns and correct singular/plural forms. Thinking revealed: The student applies noun conventions automatically enough to support fluent composition.	Shift to precision and cohesion: select specific nouns, maintain consistent references, and reduce unnecessary repetition.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Chooses noun forms strategically for specificity, cohesion, and style and can explain subtle distinctions in number, naming, and reference. Thinking revealed: The student integrates grammatical accuracy with lexical precision and reader awareness.	Extend through revision for diction, nominal reference across paragraphs, and analysis of how precise naming changes tone or clarity.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(iv) Adjectives, including comparative and superlative forms

TEKS expectation: adjectives, including their comparative and superlative forms;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Uses few useful adjectives or applies comparative/superlative forms incorrectly. Modifiers may not clearly match the noun being described. Thinking revealed: The student is beginning to understand that adjectives add information and that comparisons require specific forms.	Use concrete comparison tasks with real objects or images. Build adjective → comparative → superlative sets and connect each form to one, two, or three-or-more comparisons.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses basic adjectives and some common comparative/superlative forms, but may overgeneralize -er/-est or more/most and make irregular-form errors. Thinking revealed: The student knows the purpose of adjectives but is still learning form selection and precise placement.	Provide sentence frames for comparing. Contrast correct/incorrect examples and have students edit one modifier at a time in their own writing.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses relevant adjectives and common comparative/superlative forms correctly in most situations. Precision or irregular forms may still be inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student can use adjectives to make meaning more visible and can usually select the needed comparison form.	Move from adding adjectives to choosing stronger adjectives. Ask students to remove redundant modifiers and verify comparisons for logic and accuracy.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Uses adjectives and comparative/superlative forms accurately and purposefully to clarify description or comparison. Thinking revealed: The student independently controls both convention and meaning when modifying nouns.	Emphasize diction, concision, and audience effect. Use revision tasks that replace weak modifiers with precise ones rather than simply adding more.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Selects and positions modifiers strategically, handles irregular and nuanced comparisons, and can explain why a particular adjective or form best communicates the intended meaning. Thinking revealed: The student evaluates modifier choices for precision, tone, and efficiency.	Extend through stylistic comparison, mentor-text analysis, and editing challenges involving ambiguity, redundancy, or illogical comparisons.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(v) Adverbs of time and manner

TEKS expectation: adverbs that convey time and adverbs that convey manner;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Rarely uses adverbs effectively or confuses them with adjectives. The reader may not know when an action occurs or how it is carried out. Thinking revealed: The student has limited awareness of adverbs as meaning-bearing modifiers of actions or events.	Use oral movement demonstrations and time-sequence cards. Ask “When?” and “How?” and connect the answers to short written sentences.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses familiar adverbs such as then, later, quickly, or slowly, but placement, repetition, or form can be awkward. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes the function of adverbs but is relying on a small repertoire and external prompting.	Build a categorized adverb bank and practice moving the adverb within a sentence to notice meaning and fluency. Edit repetitive choices in the student's draft.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses time and manner adverbs appropriately in most writing. Some choices may be repetitive, vague, or placed awkwardly. Thinking revealed: The student can add temporal and manner information independently in familiar contexts.	Ask students to identify where an adverb genuinely improves clarity, replace vague adverbs with precise ones, and delete unnecessary modifiers.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Uses adverbs of time and manner accurately and purposefully to clarify sequence and describe how actions occur. Thinking revealed: The student independently selects and places adverbs to support meaning without overusing them.	Shift to sentence fluency, precision, and concision. Compare adverb use with stronger verb choices and discuss when an adverb is or is not needed.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Manipulates adverb choice and placement for pacing, emphasis, and nuance and can explain how alternatives change the sentence. Thinking revealed: The student treats modifiers as strategic craft choices and monitors their effect on the reader.	Extend with stylistic revision, alternate placements, and “strong verb versus verb + adverb” decisions that require justification.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(vi) Prepositions and prepositional phrases

TEKS expectation: prepositions and prepositional phrases;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Omits, misuses, or confuses common prepositions. Prepositional phrases may be incomplete or create unclear relationships. Thinking revealed: The student is still building the spatial, temporal, and relational meaning represented by prepositions.	Use concrete location/movement demonstrations, picture descriptions, and phrase-building activities before transferring to sentences.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses common prepositions and short prepositional phrases in familiar contexts but may choose the wrong preposition or place the phrase awkwardly. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes the structure but does not yet monitor meaning and placement consistently.	Have students match phrases to the questions where/when/which one/how. Edit misplaced or unclear phrases in short sentences.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses prepositional phrases to clarify location, time, or relationships in most writing. Occasional ambiguity or awkward stacking may occur. Thinking revealed: The student's response shows functional control and growing awareness of phrase placement.	Practice moving phrases and comparing meanings. Ask students to revise one sentence for clarity by changing the phrase's position or wording.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Uses prepositions and prepositional phrases accurately and varies placement to support clear, fluent sentences. Thinking revealed: The student independently uses relational phrases as part of sentence construction and editing.	Focus on avoiding misplaced phrases, unnecessary strings of prepositional phrases, and repetitive sentence openings.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Uses and repositions prepositional phrases strategically for precision, rhythm, description, or emphasis and quickly detects ambiguity. Thinking revealed: The student evaluates the phrase from both grammatical and stylistic perspectives.	Extend through sentence imitation and revision of authentic ambiguous or overpacked sentences, requiring explanation of the improved relationship.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(vii) Pronoun cases

TEKS expectation: pronouns, including subjective, objective, and possessive cases;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Pronouns are frequently missing, incorrectly cased, or unclear in reference. The reader may not know who or what a pronoun refers to. Thinking revealed: The student has limited control of pronoun function and antecedent reference.	Use noun-to-pronoun replacement with oral examples. Teach subject, object, and possessive roles through sentence frames before adding terminology.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses common pronouns correctly in simple sentences but makes case or reference errors in compound structures, possessives, or longer passages. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes familiar forms but has not generalized pronoun case across sentence positions.	Use substitution tests and short error-analysis tasks. Have the student replace the pronoun with the noun to check meaning, then select the correct case.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses subjective, objective, and possessive pronouns correctly in most writing with occasional errors in complex constructions or unclear antecedents. Thinking revealed: The student's grammatical reasoning is visible and usually supports clear reference.	Practice more complex contexts and pronoun-reference editing across multiple sentences rather than isolated items.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Consistently selects correct pronoun case and maintains clear references throughout a composition. Thinking revealed: The student independently monitors grammatical role and reader clarity.	Shift from basic case practice to cohesion, avoiding ambiguous pronouns, and efficient self-editing in authentic drafts.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Accurately handles subtle pronoun-case and reference situations, revises ambiguous antecedents proactively, and can explain the grammatical reasoning. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates metalinguistic awareness and treats pronoun choice as a cohesion tool.	Extend with authentic editorial examples, compound constructions, and revision tasks where students defend both case and reference decisions.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(viii) Coordinating conjunctions

TEKS expectation: coordinating conjunctions to form compound subjects, predicates, and sentences;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Joins ideas without a clear conjunction, creates run-ons, or uses and repeatedly without controlling the relationship among words or clauses. Thinking revealed: The student has limited understanding of how coordination connects equal grammatical elements.	Build compound subjects and predicates orally and with sentence strips. Explicitly contrast joining words, phrases, and complete sentences.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses common conjunctions such as and, but, or to join some elements, but logic, punctuation, or sentence boundaries are inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes coordination but is still learning what is being joined and what punctuation is required.	Use “What two things are being joined?” as the editing question. Practice conjunction choice and distinguish compound predicates from compound sentences.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses coordinating conjunctions appropriately for compound subjects, predicates, and sentences in most familiar contexts, with occasional punctuation or relationship errors. Thinking revealed: The student can construct coordinated ideas and usually select a conjunction that reflects the intended relationship.	Use sentence-combining tasks that require choosing among and, but, or, so, yet, etc. Ask for a rationale tied to meaning.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently forms and edits compound subjects, predicates, and sentences using coordinating conjunctions accurately and purposefully. Thinking revealed: The student coordinates grammar, punctuation, and logical relationships while composing.	Shift toward sentence variety and avoiding over-coordination. Ask students to choose when combining improves flow and when separate sentences are stronger.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Uses coordination strategically for emphasis, rhythm, contrast, addition, or progression and compares multiple sentence-combining possibilities. Thinking revealed: The student treats conjunction choice and coordination as rhetorical decisions as well as grammatical ones.	Extend with mentor sentences, stylistic imitation, and revision challenges in which students defend the strongest combining option.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(ix) Capitalization of titles, holidays, and geographical names/places

TEKS expectation: capitalization of official titles of people, holidays, and geographical names and places;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Capitalization is random or based mainly on sentence position. Official titles, holidays, and geographical names are frequently lowercase or inconsistently capitalized. Thinking revealed: The student has not yet formed reliable categories for when a word functions as a proper name or official title.	Teach one category at a time with name/not-a-name sorting. Use short authentic examples and visual cues showing the exact words that belong to the proper name.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Capitalizes familiar names and holidays but is inconsistent with official titles, multiword geographical names, or whether a title is being used officially. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes obvious proper nouns but is still developing contextual decision making.	Use contrast pairs such as “the president / President ____” and “the river / the ____ River.” Require the student to state the reason for the capital letter.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Correctly capitalizes most official titles, holidays, and geographical names/places, with occasional errors in less familiar or context-dependent examples. Thinking revealed: The student can apply the rule in common contexts and self-correct visible errors.	Use mixed-category editing passages and ask students to mark only the words they are uncertain about, then verify the governing rule.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Consistently applies capitalization conventions to official titles, holidays, and geographical names/places and independently edits errors. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes the contextual function of names and titles during authentic composition.	Move from drills to proofreading efficiency and application in content-area writing, research, and correspondence.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Explains context-sensitive capitalization choices, detects subtle errors in complex multiword names or titles, and applies conventions accurately in unfamiliar contexts. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates rule generalization and metalinguistic control rather than memorized correction alone.	Extend with authentic documents, editorial challenges, and examples where capitalization changes because a title or geographic term changes function.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(x) Apostrophes and commas

TEKS expectation: punctuation marks, including apostrophes in contractions and possessives and commas in compound sentences and items in a series;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Apostrophes and commas are frequently omitted, inserted randomly, or used without regard to contractions, possession, clause boundaries, or series. Thinking revealed: The student has limited understanding that punctuation represents specific grammatical relationships and boundaries.	Teach one punctuation function at a time using manipulatives and oral phrasing. Connect apostrophes to missing letters/ownership and commas to specific structures.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Correctly punctuates some contractions and simple lists but inconsistently marks possessives or commas in compound sentences. Thinking revealed: The student knows several punctuation patterns but does not yet identify the underlying structure reliably.	Use “name the job” editing: contraction, possession, list, or two complete sentences. Then choose punctuation based on that job.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Uses apostrophes and commas correctly in most familiar constructions. Errors occur with plural possessives, longer compound sentences, or more complex series. Thinking revealed: The student’s punctuation reasoning is visible and usually accurate, but complexity can reduce monitoring.	Increase structural variety and use editing passages drawn from student writing. Ask students to explain the grammatical cue that justifies each mark.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Consistently uses and edits apostrophes in contractions/possessives and commas in compound sentences/series. Thinking revealed: The student coordinates punctuation with sentence structure and meaning independently.	Shift toward proofreading efficiency, sentence fluency, and authentic application rather than isolated punctuation practice.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Uses punctuation deliberately and accurately in complex contexts, diagnoses ambiguity, and can explain how punctuation changes meaning or rhythm. Thinking revealed: The student integrates convention knowledge with reader awareness and editorial judgment.	Extend with ambiguous examples, editorial comparisons, and sentence-revision tasks in which punctuation choices must be defended.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(D)(xi) Grade-appropriate spelling patterns and high-frequency words

TEKS expectation: correct spelling of words with grade-appropriate orthographic patterns and rules and high-frequency words;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Spelling is largely phonetic or inconsistent, and high-frequency words or common grade-level patterns are often incorrect. Thinking revealed: The student is relying primarily on sound and has limited access to stable orthographic patterns in written production.	Provide explicit pattern instruction, word building, sound-to-pattern mapping, and high-frequency word routines. Limit the number of target patterns in a single lesson.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Applies some familiar spelling patterns and spells many high-frequency words correctly, but transfer to new words and independent writing is inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student has developing pattern knowledge but may revert to guessing under composition demands.	Use word sorts, analogy words, and immediate transfer: learn the pattern, then use it in sentences and the student's draft. Teach a consistent self-check routine.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Correctly spells most grade-appropriate patterns and high-frequency words and uses strategies to correct many errors. Less familiar patterns or multisyllabic words may remain difficult. Thinking revealed: The student can access and apply orthographic knowledge in authentic writing with occasional breakdowns.	Move toward morphology, syllable patterns, and strategic resource use. Ask the student to explain which known pattern supports a spelling choice.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently applies grade-appropriate orthographic patterns/rules and high-frequency word knowledge and self-corrects errors during editing. Thinking revealed: The student's spelling knowledge is sufficiently automatic to support fluent writing and purposeful proofreading.	Target individual error patterns, word families, morphology, and efficient editing rather than broad reteaching.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Generalizes known patterns to unfamiliar words, uses morphological and orthographic reasoning, and can explain or verify complex spelling choices. Thinking revealed: The student treats spelling as a system of patterns, meaning units, and exceptions rather than isolated memorization.	Extend with etymology/morphology connections, word-study investigations, and proofreading tasks that require justification of competing spellings.

TEKS 11 , Writing Process

11(E) Publish for appropriate audiences

TEKS expectation: publish written work for appropriate audiences.

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Produces an unfinished, difficult-to-read, or minimally corrected draft. The final product shows little awareness that another person will read or use it. Thinking revealed: The student sees writing primarily as task completion rather than communication with an audience.	Model the difference between draft and published copy. Use a short publication checklist for completeness, readability, basic corrections, and intended reader.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Produces a recognizable final copy with support. Some corrections or formatting are present, but presentation and audience fit remain inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student understands that publication involves preparation for a reader but still relies on teacher-directed finishing steps.	Use exemplars and a two-step checklist: “Can the reader read it?” and “Does it fit the reader?” Confer on one presentation choice at a time.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Publishes a complete, readable product with most revisions/editing incorporated and basic formatting appropriate to the audience. Thinking revealed: The student can move a draft toward a reader-ready product and makes visible audience-aware choices.	Reduce checklist dependence. Ask students to select an appropriate format, title, layout, or delivery method and explain one audience-based choice.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently produces a polished final work whose format, conventions, and presentation fit the intended audience and purpose. Thinking revealed: The student treats publication as the final communication stage and monitors quality before release.	Increase authenticity: class publications, digital products, letters, displays, or peer audiences. Use feedback loops rather than teacher correction alone.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Makes strategic publication decisions about medium, layout, visuals, tone, and final refinements; seeks and applies feedback based on anticipated reader response. Thinking revealed: The student evaluates the final product from the audience’s perspective and recognizes publication as design and communication.	Extend through multiple audiences or modes, editorial boards, peer review, and reflection on how publication choices altered access, clarity, or impact.

TEKS 12

Genres

12(A) Compose literary texts: personal narratives and poetry

TEKS expectation: compose literary texts, including personal narratives and poetry, using genre characteristics and craft;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Produces a list, summary, or loosely related sentences with few recognizable narrative or poetic characteristics. Craft choices are largely absent. Thinking revealed: The student may have ideas to share but has not yet organized them through the expectations of a literary genre.	Teach one genre at a time with clear mentor-text features. Use oral storytelling, event sequencing, sensory detail, line/stanza modeling, and imitation before independent composition.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses some genre characteristics, such as characters/events in a narrative or line breaks/repetition in a poem, but features and craft are incomplete or inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes what the genre looks like but is still learning how genre features create meaning.	Use a small craft menu and focused imitation. Ask the student to add or strengthen one required genre feature and explain what it does for the reader.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Creates a recognizable personal narrative or poem with relevant details and several appropriate genre characteristics. Craft is visible but may be uneven or predictable. Thinking revealed: The student can sustain the genre and intentionally use some craft choices to shape the reader's experience.	Move beyond feature checklists. Compare mentor passages and ask students to revise one craft element, voice, imagery, pacing, dialogue, repetition, or structure, for stronger effect.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently composes meaningful literary texts using genre characteristics and craft to develop experience, image, emotion, or idea. Thinking revealed: The student controls genre conventions and uses craft purposefully rather than decoratively.	Increase choice and complexity. Ask students to select craft techniques based on intended effect and to revise for consistency of voice and genre.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Adapts or blends literary conventions strategically, using voice, imagery, structure, pacing, sound, or other craft choices to create nuanced effects and can explain those decisions. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates authorial thinking and evaluates how craft shapes interpretation.	Extend with style studies, alternate versions, audience shifts, and reflection comparing the impact of different literary choices.

TEKS 12 , Genres

12(B) Compose informational texts

TEKS expectation: compose informational texts, including brief compositions that convey information about a topic, using a clear central idea and genre characteristics and craft;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Writing lists facts or unrelated information without a clear central idea. Informational structure and genre features are minimal or absent. Thinking revealed: The student is gathering or repeating information but has not yet organized it around a communicative focus.	Use a topic → central idea → supporting detail progression. Sort facts by relevance and build a short shared paragraph before independent writing.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: States a topic and emerging central idea with some relevant information, but organization, explanation, or informational craft is incomplete. Thinking revealed: The student understands that informational writing teaches the reader but may confuse topic with central idea or rely on fact listing.	Provide central-idea frames and a reason/detail organizer. Require each fact to answer “How does this help teach the central idea?”
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Conveys information around a clear central idea using mostly relevant facts/details and recognizable informational organization. Development or craft may be uneven. Thinking revealed: The student can organize information into a meaningful explanation and shows visible control of genre expectations.	Reduce frames. Strengthen elaboration, transitions, domain-specific vocabulary, and the connection between evidence and explanation.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently composes a focused, coherent informational text with a clear central idea, relevant development, and purposeful genre characteristics/craft. Thinking revealed: The student synthesizes information for a reader rather than merely reproducing source material.	Increase source complexity and audience demands. Ask students to select organizational structures and explain how those structures support understanding.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Synthesizes information strategically, shapes structure around reader needs, uses precise language and craft, and evaluates which facts, examples, or explanations best clarify the central idea. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates explanatory judgment and manages both content accuracy and reader comprehension.	Extend with multi-source synthesis, competing organizational choices, visual/text integration, and revision for precision, concision, and accessibility.

12(C) Compose argumentative texts and opinion essays

TEKS expectation: compose argumentative texts, including opinion essays, using genre characteristics and craft;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Opinion or claim is missing, unclear, or unsupported. The response may simply retell information or state a preference without a reason. Thinking revealed: The student has not yet separated “what I think” from “why the reader should accept it.”	Use oral claim/reason practice and sorting of opinions versus reasons. Build one claim + one relevant reason before adding evidence.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: States an opinion or claim and provides at least one reason, but support may be general, repetitive, or weakly connected to the claim. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes the basic architecture of argument but is still developing relevance and logical linkage.	Use because/so reasoning chains, evidence matching, and a simple claim-reason-evidence organizer. Ask the student to explain the connection aloud.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Presents a clear position with relevant reasons and some supporting evidence or examples. Organization is recognizable, though explanation and persuasive craft may be uneven. Thinking revealed: The student can build a visible line of reasoning and sustain an opinion across a brief composition.	Strengthen evidence quality, explanation, transitions, and conclusion. Ask students to rank reasons and remove support that does not advance the claim.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently composes a coherent argumentative/opinion text using appropriate genre characteristics, relevant reasons/evidence, explanation, and purposeful craft. Thinking revealed: The student controls the logic of the response and anticipates what the reader needs in order to follow the argument.	Increase complexity through multi-source evidence and less familiar topics. Encourage audience-aware word choice and stronger reasoning rather than additional length.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Strategically weighs evidence, anticipates alternative viewpoints or reader questions, refines claims, and uses craft to increase credibility and impact. Thinking revealed: The student evaluates the argument as a system of choices and can explain why some evidence or phrasing is more persuasive than another.	Extend with counterclaim awareness, source-quality comparisons, audience shifts, and revision tasks that require defending rhetorical and evidence choices.

12(D) Compose correspondence

TEKS expectation: compose correspondence such as thank you notes or letters.

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Message purpose or audience is unclear. Important correspondence features such as greeting, message, closing, or signature may be missing. Thinking revealed: The student is writing words on a page without yet fully representing the social purpose and structure of correspondence.	Use authentic models and a simple purpose/audience/parts checklist. Rehearse the message orally before writing.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Creates a recognizable note or letter with some appropriate features, but tone, completeness, organization, or conventions are inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student understands the format but may be completing parts mechanically rather than shaping a message for the recipient.	Compare formal/informal examples and highlight how audience changes wording. Use short revision prompts focused on one missing or mismatched feature.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Writes a complete note or letter with a clear purpose, appropriate basic format, and generally suitable tone and details. Thinking revealed: The student can coordinate format, content, and recipient needs in familiar correspondence tasks.	Reduce templates and vary recipients/purposes. Ask the student to explain one wording or format choice based on the audience.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently composes well-organized correspondence with appropriate conventions, tone, relevant details, and a clear audience/purpose match. Thinking revealed: The student uses correspondence conventions as tools for effective communication.	Use authentic writing opportunities and emphasize concise, audience-appropriate language, proofreading, and independent format selection.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Adapts tone, structure, level of detail, and format strategically to the relationship, context, and desired reader response. Thinking revealed: The student anticipates how the recipient may interpret the message and revises accordingly.	Extend with multiple audiences, sensitive or complex purposes, digital versus print correspondence, and reflection on tone and reader impact.

TEKS 13

Inquiry & Research

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(A) Generate inquiry questions

TEKS expectation: generate questions on a topic for formal and informal inquiry;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Produces statements, unrelated questions, or yes/no questions that cannot effectively guide investigation. Thinking revealed: The student is interested in the topic but has limited understanding of how a question drives inquiry.	Model question generation from images, short texts, and “I wonder” statements. Sort researchable/non-researchable questions and revise one weak question together.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Generates relevant factual questions with prompting, but questions may be broad, repetitive, or answerable with one fact. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes that inquiry begins with questions but still needs support to create depth or focus.	Use question stems for how, why, what causes, what changes, and what is the relationship. Practice narrowing broad questions.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Generates several relevant, researchable questions, including some open-ended questions. May still need help prioritizing or narrowing them. Thinking revealed: The student’s curiosity is becoming organized into a usable inquiry path.	Ask students to rank questions by importance and researchability, combine overlapping questions, and identify which question should come first.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently generates focused, varied questions that guide a formal or informal inquiry and align to the purpose of the research. Thinking revealed: The student uses questioning as a planning tool and can anticipate information needed to answer the larger inquiry.	Increase topic complexity and require subquestions. Allow students to revise questions after preliminary research rather than locking them in.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Generates layered questions, recognizes relationships and gaps, and revises or creates new questions as findings reshape the inquiry. Thinking revealed: The student treats questioning as recursive thinking and uses emerging evidence to deepen investigation.	Extend with student-designed inquiry, question webs, unanswered-question analysis, and reflection on how questions changed during research.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(B) Develop and follow a research plan with adult assistance

TEKS expectation: develop and follow a research plan with adult assistance;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Begins searching or writing without a sequence of steps and has difficulty following even a simple plan without frequent redirection. Thinking revealed: The student does not yet see research as a managed process with stages and decisions.	Use a short visual research pathway with one step revealed at a time. Model stopping to check progress before moving to the next step.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Follows a teacher-provided plan and completes some steps, but needs frequent reminders about sequence, resources, or task completion. Thinking revealed: The student can participate in a plan but has limited ownership or monitoring of the process.	Co-create a checklist and have the student mark completed steps, next steps, and needed help. Keep adult support explicit but gradually less directive.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Helps develop a research plan with an adult, identifies major tasks or sources, and follows most steps with occasional redirection. Thinking revealed: The student can visualize the research process and is beginning to manage sequence and progress.	Ask the student to predict time/resources, identify a likely challenge, and conduct brief self-checks at predetermined checkpoints.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: With appropriate adult assistance, independently carries out the plan, monitors progress, and adjusts steps when new needs arise. Thinking revealed: The student uses the plan as a working management tool rather than a compliance checklist.	Shift adult assistance to conferencing and decision support. Require the student to identify what changed, why, and what the new next step should be.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Uses adult assistance strategically, anticipates obstacles, revises the plan based on evidence or changing questions, and can explain the logic of the research sequence. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates project-management thinking and metacognitive control of the inquiry process.	Extend with longer-term inquiry, student-set milestones, contingency planning, and reflection on which planning choices improved efficiency or quality.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(C) Identify and gather relevant information from varied sources

TEKS expectation: identify and gather relevant information from a variety of sources;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Copies or records the first information found regardless of relevance and may rely on a single source. Thinking revealed: The student is equating “found information” with “useful evidence.”	Model relevance using a research question and think aloud: “Does this answer my question?” Sort source notes into relevant/not relevant before recording them.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Finds some relevant information with prompts and uses more than one source when directed, but note selection may include unrelated or repetitive material. Thinking revealed: The student can locate information but needs support evaluating its usefulness.	Provide a relevance filter: question answered, new information, source name. Require paraphrased notes rather than full copied passages when appropriate.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Gathers mostly relevant information from multiple source types and can distinguish useful from less useful information with occasional support. Thinking revealed: The student’s source selection and note-taking are visibly guided by the inquiry question.	Increase source variety and ask students to group notes by subquestion, remove duplicate information, and identify an information gap.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently selects and records relevant information from a variety of appropriate sources to answer research questions. Thinking revealed: The student evaluates information for fit and manages evidence across sources rather than accumulating facts indiscriminately.	Shift to source credibility, sufficiency, and efficiency. Ask students to justify why a source or note deserves inclusion.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Cross-checks sources, recognizes gaps or conflicts, prioritizes stronger evidence, and deliberately seeks additional information when the evidence base is incomplete. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates evaluative research thinking and treats relevance as part of a larger evidence-quality judgment.	Extend with conflicting-source sets, source triangulation, evidence-ranking tasks, and student-generated criteria for when research is sufficient.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(D) Identify primary and secondary sources

TEKS expectation: identify primary and secondary sources;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Cannot reliably distinguish a source created by a participant/witness from a later account or analysis. Thinking revealed: The student is noticing source content but not yet considering the source's relationship to the event or topic.	Use concrete paired examples, diary vs. textbook, interview vs. biography, photograph vs. later article, and ask "Who created this and when?"
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Correctly identifies obvious primary or secondary examples with cues but becomes confused by unfamiliar formats or sources that contain mixed material. Thinking revealed: The student has a developing definition but relies on surface features rather than source context.	Use a decision routine: creator, time, relationship to event, purpose. Practice ambiguous examples and require a one-sentence reason.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Correctly classifies familiar primary and secondary sources and provides a basic explanation for most choices. Thinking revealed: The student can use source origin and relationship to the topic as evidence for classification.	Increase the variety of formats and contexts. Ask when each source type would be useful for a particular research question.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently identifies primary and secondary sources within authentic research and selects the type that best fits the information needed. Thinking revealed: The student connects source classification to research purpose, not just vocabulary recall.	Shift from labeling to source selection and evaluation. Require students to justify why a primary or secondary source is preferable for a given question.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Evaluates the strengths and limitations of primary and secondary sources, recognizes mixed or derivative sources, and combines source types strategically. Thinking revealed: The student understands that source type affects perspective, proximity, interpretation, and evidentiary value.	Extend with source sets containing bias, incomplete records, retrospective accounts, and questions requiring complementary primary/secondary evidence.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(E) Demonstrate understanding of gathered information

TEKS expectation: demonstrate understanding of information gathered;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Repeats or copies isolated facts but cannot explain them, connect them to the research question, or answer basic questions about meaning. Thinking revealed: The student has collected information without yet processing it into understanding.	Use oral retell, sketch-notes, “say it in your own words,” and fact-to-question matching before requiring written synthesis.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Restates some information accurately and can answer basic questions, but explanations are fragmented and connections among ideas are limited. Thinking revealed: The student is moving from recall toward comprehension but still treats pieces of information separately.	Use sentence stems for because, this means, this connects to, and the important idea is. Ask students to group related notes.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Summarizes key information in own words and makes some accurate connections among facts or sources. May need support with inference or synthesis. Thinking revealed: The response shows visible comprehension beyond copying and can support a basic explanation of the topic.	Ask students to combine two notes into one explanation, compare sources, and identify the most important conclusion supported by the information.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently explains and synthesizes gathered information, uses it to answer research questions, and distinguishes central ideas from supporting details. Thinking revealed: The student transforms source information into organized knowledge and can communicate understanding accurately.	Increase multi-source demands and ask students to support interpretations with evidence while noting where the evidence is incomplete.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Integrates information across sources, identifies patterns or implications, revises prior understanding when evidence changes, and explains the reasoning behind conclusions. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates flexible, evidence-responsive understanding rather than static recall.	Extend with conflicting evidence, synthesis matrices, inference tasks, and reflection on how new information changed the student’s original thinking.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(F) Distinguish paraphrasing from plagiarism

TEKS expectation: recognize the difference between paraphrasing and plagiarism when using source materials;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Copies source wording without attribution and cannot reliably explain why copying is different from putting information into one's own words. Thinking revealed: The student has not yet developed a functional concept of source ownership and responsible reuse.	Use short side-by-side examples: exact copy, acceptable paraphrase, and copied-but-changed-a-few-words. Teach “read, cover, say, write, check.”
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Recognizes obvious word-for-word copying as plagiarism but may create paraphrases that stay too close to the original or omit source credit. Thinking revealed: The student understands the rule in clear examples but needs support applying it while writing.	Practice one- or two-sentence paraphrases with source acknowledgement. Highlight retained wording that is too close and revise it together.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Paraphrases straightforward source material in substantially original wording and identifies plagiarism in common examples, with occasional patchwriting or attribution errors. Thinking revealed: The student can preserve meaning while changing language but may still struggle when source language is dense or technical.	Use increasingly complex passages, compare original/paraphrase for meaning accuracy, and teach note-taking that separates source language from student language.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Consistently distinguishes paraphrasing from plagiarism, paraphrases accurately in own words, and credits sources appropriately in the expected format. Thinking revealed: The student independently monitors both meaning and source responsibility during research writing.	Shift toward synthesis across sources and efficient attribution. Use authentic research drafts rather than isolated plagiarism exercises.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Explains subtle cases such as patchwriting, preserves technical meaning while substantially restructuring language, and evaluates whether attribution is sufficient. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates ethical and metalinguistic awareness of how source ideas and wording are incorporated.	Extend with complex source integration, quotation-versus-paraphrase decisions, and editorial review of borderline examples requiring justification.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(G) Create a works cited page

TEKS expectation: create a works cited page;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Omits a works cited page or records incomplete source fragments that would not allow the source to be identified. Thinking revealed: The student does not yet understand the purpose of documenting sources as part of research communication.	Model source-to-entry transfer using one source type. Use labeled source-information cards and build a single complete entry together.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Creates a source list with support, but entries may omit required information, use inconsistent order, or mix citation features. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes that sources must be documented but relies on a model for each step.	Use a citation template/checklist and color-code author/title/publication/URL or other required elements. Practice checking an entry against the original source.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Creates a usable works cited page with most required information and generally consistent formatting; minor errors remain across source types. Thinking revealed: The student can translate source information into a citation structure and understands the purpose of the page.	Reduce templates, introduce multiple source types, and have students use a consistency check across entries rather than correcting one entry at a time.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently creates a complete, consistently formatted works cited page using the citation expectations provided for the assignment. Thinking revealed: The student treats citation as an integrated research responsibility and can verify entries against sources.	Shift to efficiency, source-management routines, and accurate handling of less familiar source types.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Audits citations for completeness and consistency, resolves missing or ambiguous source information, and applies the required format accurately across varied sources. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates editorial control and understands citations as a system for traceability and credibility.	Extend with complex source types, citation troubleshooting, and peer audits in which students explain and defend formatting decisions.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(H) Present research results using an appropriate mode

TEKS expectation: use an appropriate mode of delivery, whether written, oral, or multimodal, to present results.

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Presents incomplete or copied information with little organization and uses a delivery mode that does not clearly communicate the findings to the audience. Thinking revealed: The student is focused on having something to present rather than selecting a mode that helps the audience understand the research.	Model the same content in written, oral, and multimodal forms. Ask which mode helps a particular audience and why. Provide a short presentation structure.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses an assigned delivery mode with support and communicates some findings, but organization, audience awareness, visuals, pacing, or explanation may be inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student can participate in a presentation format but is not yet making independent delivery decisions.	Use a purpose/audience/mode planning card. Practice one delivery feature at a time, organization, speaking volume, visual relevance, or written readability.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Chooses or uses an appropriate written, oral, or multimodal mode and communicates the key findings clearly, with some unevenness in design or delivery. Thinking revealed: The student understands that presentation is a translation of research for an audience and can make visible delivery choices.	Ask the student to explain why the mode fits the audience and revise one feature to improve clarity, emphasis, or accessibility.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently matches delivery mode to audience and purpose, organizes findings coherently, and uses written, oral, or multimodal features effectively. Thinking revealed: The student coordinates content, evidence, organization, and delivery as part of a complete research communication process.	Increase authenticity and choice. Require students to select the mode, manage time/space, and respond to audience questions or feedback.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Selects, combines, or adapts modes strategically; designs the presentation around audience needs; and can defend delivery choices while responding flexibly to questions or feedback. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates rhetorical and metacognitive control of how research is communicated.	Extend with multiple audiences, multimodal design constraints, live Q&A, and reflection on how a different mode would change reach, clarity, or impact.

12(A) Compose literary texts: personal narratives and poetry

TEKS expectation: compose literary texts, including personal narratives and poetry, using genre characteristics and craft;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Produces a list, summary, or loosely related sentences with few recognizable narrative or poetic characteristics. Craft choices are largely absent. Thinking revealed: The student may have ideas to share but has not yet organized them through the expectations of a literary genre.	Teach one genre at a time with clear mentor-text features. Use oral storytelling, event sequencing, sensory detail, line/stanza modeling, and imitation before independent composition.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses some genre characteristics, such as characters/events in a narrative or line breaks/repetition in a poem, but features and craft are incomplete or inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes what the genre looks like but is still learning how genre features create meaning.	Use a small craft menu and focused imitation. Ask the student to add or strengthen one required genre feature and explain what it does for the reader.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Creates a recognizable personal narrative or poem with relevant details and several appropriate genre characteristics. Craft is visible but may be uneven or predictable. Thinking revealed: The student can sustain the genre and intentionally use some craft choices to shape the reader's experience.	Move beyond feature checklists. Compare mentor passages and ask students to revise one craft element, voice, imagery, pacing, dialogue, repetition, or structure, for stronger effect.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently composes meaningful literary texts using genre characteristics and craft to develop experience, image, emotion, or idea. Thinking revealed: The student controls genre conventions and uses craft purposefully rather than decoratively.	Increase choice and complexity. Ask students to select craft techniques based on intended effect and to revise for consistency of voice and genre.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Adapts or blends literary conventions strategically, using voice, imagery, structure, pacing, sound, or other craft choices to create nuanced effects and can explain those decisions. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates authorial thinking and evaluates how craft shapes interpretation.	Extend with style studies, alternate versions, audience shifts, and reflection comparing the impact of different literary choices.

TEKS 12 , Genres

12(B) Compose informational texts

TEKS expectation: compose informational texts, including brief compositions that convey information about a topic, using a clear central idea and genre characteristics and craft;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Writing lists facts or unrelated information without a clear central idea. Informational structure and genre features are minimal or absent. Thinking revealed: The student is gathering or repeating information but has not yet organized it around a communicative focus.	Use a topic → central idea → supporting detail progression. Sort facts by relevance and build a short shared paragraph before independent writing.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: States a topic and emerging central idea with some relevant information, but organization, explanation, or informational craft is incomplete. Thinking revealed: The student understands that informational writing teaches the reader but may confuse topic with central idea or rely on fact listing.	Provide central-idea frames and a reason/detail organizer. Require each fact to answer “How does this help teach the central idea?”
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Conveys information around a clear central idea using mostly relevant facts/details and recognizable informational organization. Development or craft may be uneven. Thinking revealed: The student can organize information into a meaningful explanation and shows visible control of genre expectations.	Reduce frames. Strengthen elaboration, transitions, domain-specific vocabulary, and the connection between evidence and explanation.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently composes a focused, coherent informational text with a clear central idea, relevant development, and purposeful genre characteristics/craft. Thinking revealed: The student synthesizes information for a reader rather than merely reproducing source material.	Increase source complexity and audience demands. Ask students to select organizational structures and explain how those structures support understanding.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Synthesizes information strategically, shapes structure around reader needs, uses precise language and craft, and evaluates which facts, examples, or explanations best clarify the central idea. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates explanatory judgment and manages both content accuracy and reader comprehension.	Extend with multi-source synthesis, competing organizational choices, visual/text integration, and revision for precision, concision, and accessibility.

12(C) Compose argumentative texts and opinion essays

TEKS expectation: compose argumentative texts, including opinion essays, using genre characteristics and craft;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Opinion or claim is missing, unclear, or unsupported. The response may simply retell information or state a preference without a reason. Thinking revealed: The student has not yet separated “what I think” from “why the reader should accept it.”	Use oral claim/reason practice and sorting of opinions versus reasons. Build one claim + one relevant reason before adding evidence.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: States an opinion or claim and provides at least one reason, but support may be general, repetitive, or weakly connected to the claim. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes the basic architecture of argument but is still developing relevance and logical linkage.	Use because/so reasoning chains, evidence matching, and a simple claim-reason-evidence organizer. Ask the student to explain the connection aloud.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Presents a clear position with relevant reasons and some supporting evidence or examples. Organization is recognizable, though explanation and persuasive craft may be uneven. Thinking revealed: The student can build a visible line of reasoning and sustain an opinion across a brief composition.	Strengthen evidence quality, explanation, transitions, and conclusion. Ask students to rank reasons and remove support that does not advance the claim.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently composes a coherent argumentative/opinion text using appropriate genre characteristics, relevant reasons/evidence, explanation, and purposeful craft. Thinking revealed: The student controls the logic of the response and anticipates what the reader needs in order to follow the argument.	Increase complexity through multi-source evidence and less familiar topics. Encourage audience-aware word choice and stronger reasoning rather than additional length.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Strategically weighs evidence, anticipates alternative viewpoints or reader questions, refines claims, and uses craft to increase credibility and impact. Thinking revealed: The student evaluates the argument as a system of choices and can explain why some evidence or phrasing is more persuasive than another.	Extend with counterclaim awareness, source-quality comparisons, audience shifts, and revision tasks that require defending rhetorical and evidence choices.

12(D) Compose correspondence

TEKS expectation: compose correspondence such as thank you notes or letters.

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Message purpose or audience is unclear. Important correspondence features such as greeting, message, closing, or signature may be missing. Thinking revealed: The student is writing words on a page without yet fully representing the social purpose and structure of correspondence.	Use authentic models and a simple purpose/audience/parts checklist. Rehearse the message orally before writing.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Creates a recognizable note or letter with some appropriate features, but tone, completeness, organization, or conventions are inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student understands the format but may be completing parts mechanically rather than shaping a message for the recipient.	Compare formal/informal examples and highlight how audience changes wording. Use short revision prompts focused on one missing or mismatched feature.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Writes a complete note or letter with a clear purpose, appropriate basic format, and generally suitable tone and details. Thinking revealed: The student can coordinate format, content, and recipient needs in familiar correspondence tasks.	Reduce templates and vary recipients/purposes. Ask the student to explain one wording or format choice based on the audience.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently composes well-organized correspondence with appropriate conventions, tone, relevant details, and a clear audience/purpose match. Thinking revealed: The student uses correspondence conventions as tools for effective communication.	Use authentic writing opportunities and emphasize concise, audience-appropriate language, proofreading, and independent format selection.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Adapts tone, structure, level of detail, and format strategically to the relationship, context, and desired reader response. Thinking revealed: The student anticipates how the recipient may interpret the message and revises accordingly.	Extend with multiple audiences, sensitive or complex purposes, digital versus print correspondence, and reflection on tone and reader impact.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(A) Generate inquiry questions

TEKS expectation: generate questions on a topic for formal and informal inquiry;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Produces statements, unrelated questions, or yes/no questions that cannot effectively guide investigation. Thinking revealed: The student is interested in the topic but has limited understanding of how a question drives inquiry.	Model question generation from images, short texts, and “I wonder” statements. Sort researchable/non-researchable questions and revise one weak question together.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Generates relevant factual questions with prompting, but questions may be broad, repetitive, or answerable with one fact. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes that inquiry begins with questions but still needs support to create depth or focus.	Use question stems for how, why, what causes, what changes, and what is the relationship. Practice narrowing broad questions.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Generates several relevant, researchable questions, including some open-ended questions. May still need help prioritizing or narrowing them. Thinking revealed: The student’s curiosity is becoming organized into a usable inquiry path.	Ask students to rank questions by importance and researchability, combine overlapping questions, and identify which question should come first.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently generates focused, varied questions that guide a formal or informal inquiry and align to the purpose of the research. Thinking revealed: The student uses questioning as a planning tool and can anticipate information needed to answer the larger inquiry.	Increase topic complexity and require subquestions. Allow students to revise questions after preliminary research rather than locking them in.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Generates layered questions, recognizes relationships and gaps, and revises or creates new questions as findings reshape the inquiry. Thinking revealed: The student treats questioning as recursive thinking and uses emerging evidence to deepen investigation.	Extend with student-designed inquiry, question webs, unanswered-question analysis, and reflection on how questions changed during research.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(B) Develop and follow a research plan with adult assistance

TEKS expectation: develop and follow a research plan with adult assistance;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Begins searching or writing without a sequence of steps and has difficulty following even a simple plan without frequent redirection. Thinking revealed: The student does not yet see research as a managed process with stages and decisions.	Use a short visual research pathway with one step revealed at a time. Model stopping to check progress before moving to the next step.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Follows a teacher-provided plan and completes some steps, but needs frequent reminders about sequence, resources, or task completion. Thinking revealed: The student can participate in a plan but has limited ownership or monitoring of the process.	Co-create a checklist and have the student mark completed steps, next steps, and needed help. Keep adult support explicit but gradually less directive.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Helps develop a research plan with an adult, identifies major tasks or sources, and follows most steps with occasional redirection. Thinking revealed: The student can visualize the research process and is beginning to manage sequence and progress.	Ask the student to predict time/resources, identify a likely challenge, and conduct brief self-checks at predetermined checkpoints.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: With appropriate adult assistance, independently carries out the plan, monitors progress, and adjusts steps when new needs arise. Thinking revealed: The student uses the plan as a working management tool rather than a compliance checklist.	Shift adult assistance to conferencing and decision support. Require the student to identify what changed, why, and what the new next step should be.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Uses adult assistance strategically, anticipates obstacles, revises the plan based on evidence or changing questions, and can explain the logic of the research sequence. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates project-management thinking and metacognitive control of the inquiry process.	Extend with longer-term inquiry, student-set milestones, contingency planning, and reflection on which planning choices improved efficiency or quality.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(C) Identify and gather relevant information from varied sources

TEKS expectation: identify and gather relevant information from a variety of sources;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Copies or records the first information found regardless of relevance and may rely on a single source. Thinking revealed: The student is equating “found information” with “useful evidence.”	Model relevance using a research question and think aloud: “Does this answer my question?” Sort source notes into relevant/not relevant before recording them.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Finds some relevant information with prompts and uses more than one source when directed, but note selection may include unrelated or repetitive material. Thinking revealed: The student can locate information but needs support evaluating its usefulness.	Provide a relevance filter: question answered, new information, source name. Require paraphrased notes rather than full copied passages when appropriate.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Gathers mostly relevant information from multiple source types and can distinguish useful from less useful information with occasional support. Thinking revealed: The student’s source selection and note-taking are visibly guided by the inquiry question.	Increase source variety and ask students to group notes by subquestion, remove duplicate information, and identify an information gap.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently selects and records relevant information from a variety of appropriate sources to answer research questions. Thinking revealed: The student evaluates information for fit and manages evidence across sources rather than accumulating facts indiscriminately.	Shift to source credibility, sufficiency, and efficiency. Ask students to justify why a source or note deserves inclusion.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Cross-checks sources, recognizes gaps or conflicts, prioritizes stronger evidence, and deliberately seeks additional information when the evidence base is incomplete. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates evaluative research thinking and treats relevance as part of a larger evidence-quality judgment.	Extend with conflicting-source sets, source triangulation, evidence-ranking tasks, and student-generated criteria for when research is sufficient.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(D) Identify primary and secondary sources

TEKS expectation: identify primary and secondary sources;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Cannot reliably distinguish a source created by a participant/witness from a later account or analysis. Thinking revealed: The student is noticing source content but not yet considering the source's relationship to the event or topic.	Use concrete paired examples, diary vs. textbook, interview vs. biography, photograph vs. later article, and ask "Who created this and when?"
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Correctly identifies obvious primary or secondary examples with cues but becomes confused by unfamiliar formats or sources that contain mixed material. Thinking revealed: The student has a developing definition but relies on surface features rather than source context.	Use a decision routine: creator, time, relationship to event, purpose. Practice ambiguous examples and require a one-sentence reason.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Correctly classifies familiar primary and secondary sources and provides a basic explanation for most choices. Thinking revealed: The student can use source origin and relationship to the topic as evidence for classification.	Increase the variety of formats and contexts. Ask when each source type would be useful for a particular research question.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently identifies primary and secondary sources within authentic research and selects the type that best fits the information needed. Thinking revealed: The student connects source classification to research purpose, not just vocabulary recall.	Shift from labeling to source selection and evaluation. Require students to justify why a primary or secondary source is preferable for a given question.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Evaluates the strengths and limitations of primary and secondary sources, recognizes mixed or derivative sources, and combines source types strategically. Thinking revealed: The student understands that source type affects perspective, proximity, interpretation, and evidentiary value.	Extend with source sets containing bias, incomplete records, retrospective accounts, and questions requiring complementary primary/secondary evidence.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(E) Demonstrate understanding of gathered information

TEKS expectation: demonstrate understanding of information gathered;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Repeats or copies isolated facts but cannot explain them, connect them to the research question, or answer basic questions about meaning. Thinking revealed: The student has collected information without yet processing it into understanding.	Use oral retell, sketch-notes, “say it in your own words,” and fact-to-question matching before requiring written synthesis.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Restates some information accurately and can answer basic questions, but explanations are fragmented and connections among ideas are limited. Thinking revealed: The student is moving from recall toward comprehension but still treats pieces of information separately.	Use sentence stems for because, this means, this connects to, and the important idea is. Ask students to group related notes.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Summarizes key information in own words and makes some accurate connections among facts or sources. May need support with inference or synthesis. Thinking revealed: The response shows visible comprehension beyond copying and can support a basic explanation of the topic.	Ask students to combine two notes into one explanation, compare sources, and identify the most important conclusion supported by the information.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently explains and synthesizes gathered information, uses it to answer research questions, and distinguishes central ideas from supporting details. Thinking revealed: The student transforms source information into organized knowledge and can communicate understanding accurately.	Increase multi-source demands and ask students to support interpretations with evidence while noting where the evidence is incomplete.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Integrates information across sources, identifies patterns or implications, revises prior understanding when evidence changes, and explains the reasoning behind conclusions. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates flexible, evidence-responsive understanding rather than static recall.	Extend with conflicting evidence, synthesis matrices, inference tasks, and reflection on how new information changed the student’s original thinking.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(F) Distinguish paraphrasing from plagiarism

TEKS expectation: recognize the difference between paraphrasing and plagiarism when using source materials;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Copies source wording without attribution and cannot reliably explain why copying is different from putting information into one's own words. Thinking revealed: The student has not yet developed a functional concept of source ownership and responsible reuse.	Use short side-by-side examples: exact copy, acceptable paraphrase, and copied-but-changed-a-few-words. Teach “read, cover, say, write, check.”
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Recognizes obvious word-for-word copying as plagiarism but may create paraphrases that stay too close to the original or omit source credit. Thinking revealed: The student understands the rule in clear examples but needs support applying it while writing.	Practice one- or two-sentence paraphrases with source acknowledgement. Highlight retained wording that is too close and revise it together.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Paraphrases straightforward source material in substantially original wording and identifies plagiarism in common examples, with occasional patchwriting or attribution errors. Thinking revealed: The student can preserve meaning while changing language but may still struggle when source language is dense or technical.	Use increasingly complex passages, compare original/paraphrase for meaning accuracy, and teach note-taking that separates source language from student language.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Consistently distinguishes paraphrasing from plagiarism, paraphrases accurately in own words, and credits sources appropriately in the expected format. Thinking revealed: The student independently monitors both meaning and source responsibility during research writing.	Shift toward synthesis across sources and efficient attribution. Use authentic research drafts rather than isolated plagiarism exercises.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Explains subtle cases such as patchwriting, preserves technical meaning while substantially restructuring language, and evaluates whether attribution is sufficient. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates ethical and metalinguistic awareness of how source ideas and wording are incorporated.	Extend with complex source integration, quotation-versus-paraphrase decisions, and editorial review of borderline examples requiring justification.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(G) Create a works cited page

TEKS expectation: create a works cited page;

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Omits a works cited page or records incomplete source fragments that would not allow the source to be identified. Thinking revealed: The student does not yet understand the purpose of documenting sources as part of research communication.	Model source-to-entry transfer using one source type. Use labeled source-information cards and build a single complete entry together.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Creates a source list with support, but entries may omit required information, use inconsistent order, or mix citation features. Thinking revealed: The student recognizes that sources must be documented but relies on a model for each step.	Use a citation template/checklist and color-code author/title/publication/URL or other required elements. Practice checking an entry against the original source.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Creates a usable works cited page with most required information and generally consistent formatting; minor errors remain across source types. Thinking revealed: The student can translate source information into a citation structure and understands the purpose of the page.	Reduce templates, introduce multiple source types, and have students use a consistency check across entries rather than correcting one entry at a time.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently creates a complete, consistently formatted works cited page using the citation expectations provided for the assignment. Thinking revealed: The student treats citation as an integrated research responsibility and can verify entries against sources.	Shift to efficiency, source-management routines, and accurate handling of less familiar source types.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Audits citations for completeness and consistency, resolves missing or ambiguous source information, and applies the required format accurately across varied sources. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates editorial control and understands citations as a system for traceability and credibility.	Extend with complex source types, citation troubleshooting, and peer audits in which students explain and defend formatting decisions.

TEKS 13 , Inquiry & Research

13(H) Present research results using an appropriate mode

TEKS expectation: use an appropriate mode of delivery, whether written, oral, or multimodal, to present results.

Assessment note: Place the student at the highest level demonstrated consistently without support; use the next row as the target behavior for instruction and progress monitoring.

Thinking Level	Observable Performance & Thinking Evidence	Instructional Adjustment / Next Move
 Foundational (Beginning)	Student work looks like: Presents incomplete or copied information with little organization and uses a delivery mode that does not clearly communicate the findings to the audience. Thinking revealed: The student is focused on having something to present rather than selecting a mode that helps the audience understand the research.	Model the same content in written, oral, and multimodal forms. Ask which mode helps a particular audience and why. Provide a short presentation structure.
 Emergent (Developing)	Student work looks like: Uses an assigned delivery mode with support and communicates some findings, but organization, audience awareness, visuals, pacing, or explanation may be inconsistent. Thinking revealed: The student can participate in a presentation format but is not yet making independent delivery decisions.	Use a purpose/audience/mode planning card. Practice one delivery feature at a time, organization, speaking volume, visual relevance, or written readability.
 Visible (Engaging)	Student work looks like: Chooses or uses an appropriate written, oral, or multimodal mode and communicates the key findings clearly, with some unevenness in design or delivery. Thinking revealed: The student understands that presentation is a translation of research for an audience and can make visible delivery choices.	Ask the student to explain why the mode fits the audience and revise one feature to improve clarity, emphasis, or accessibility.
 Independent (Independent)	Student work looks like: Independently matches delivery mode to audience and purpose, organizes findings coherently, and uses written, oral, or multimodal features effectively. Thinking revealed: The student coordinates content, evidence, organization, and delivery as part of a complete research communication process.	Increase authenticity and choice. Require students to select the mode, manage time/space, and respond to audience questions or feedback.
 Reflective (Highly Independent)	Student work looks like: Selects, combines, or adapts modes strategically; designs the presentation around audience needs; and can defend delivery choices while responding flexibly to questions or feedback. Thinking revealed: The student demonstrates rhetorical and metacognitive control of how research is communicated.	Extend with multiple audiences, multimodal design constraints, live Q&A, and reflection on how a different mode would change reach, clarity, or impact.