Mini Text Analysis Toolkit

This tool is intended to support your intentional reflection and analysis of anchor texts to determine whether/how to use a text to support culturally responsive-sustaining, grade-level, joyful, and linguistically sustaining instruction. This tool is a condensed version of the full Text Analysis Toolkit to support more regular use.

Text:

Key Ideas of This Text:

Move forward with analyzing this text and considering for use with students?

	🚫	Text contains harmful content, such as stereotypes and/or inaccurate representation. DO NOT USE.
	⚠️	Text has one or more cautions about the way this content is presented or how this story is told that will take careful teacher planning. MOVE TO ANALYSIS, TENDING CAREFULLY TO PLANNING FOR CAUTIONS THROUGH TASKS AND ADDITIONAL RESOURCES.
	✅	No initial concerns about the way this content is presented or how this story is told; for example, this text is affirming of the characters/topics it portrays. MOVE TO ANALYSIS; USE WITH INTENTIONAL PLANNING.

Notes:

Consider what you bring to this text, what your students could bring, and how you'll prepare for instruction.

Locating Myself within This Text: Are the identities,[1] ideas, perspectives, and content of this text close to or far away from my own?	**Locating Students within This Text:** Are the identities, ideas, perspectives, and content of this text close to or far away from students? In what ways and for which students?

Research & Reflection: 💬 What do I need to know more about before engaging more deeply with this text?[2]

The quantitative complexity (Lexile) of this text is:[3]

☐ 420–820 L (Gr 2–3)	☐ 740–1010 L (Gr 4–5)	☐ 925–1185 L (Gr 6–8)	☐ 1050–1335 L (Gr 9–10)	☐ 1185–1385 L (Gr 11–12)

---

[1] In considering identity, you might think about any of the following: ability, age, body type, ethnicity, gender, home language, immigration status, socio-economic status, race, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, etc. For more, see Let's Talk, Facilitating Critical Conversations with Students, Learning for Justice, p. 6

[2] For example, you may want to learn more about a historical event, a cultural practice that is unfamiliar to you, or accurate pronunciations of proper nouns.

[3] A quantitative tool, such as a Lexile level, is one piece of information to gauge a text's overall complexity. This computer-generated numerical value is based on features such as sentence length and vocabulary complexity. To find a text's Lexile, visit https://hub.lexile.com/find-a-book/search. At times, qualitative considerations (see next page) trump quantitative measures in identifying the grade band of a text, particularly with narrative fiction in later grades.

Considering qualitative complexity and opportunities and cautions within this text:

Dimension	Which dimension(s) are most complex?[4] (Examples: Less complex → More complex)	Opportunities	Cautions
Meaning/ Purpose	☐ Meaning/Purpose *Single level of meaning → Multiple/complex* *Explicitly stated purpose → Implicit*	☐ Explores **power, equity**, **justice**, or **injustice** ☐ Messages **disrupt stereotypes**/dominant ways of thinking ☐ Tells **own stories** (consider shared identity markers of author and characters/content, lived experiences, etc.)	☐ Messages **reinforce and accept the status quo** (e.g., do not showcase ability to organize for change, do not challenge preconceived notions). ☐ Messages (text/images) **reinforce dominant** ways of thinking or **stereotypes**.
Structure	☐ Structure *Simple → Complex* *Explicit → Implicit* *Common traits to genre → Uncommon traits* *Simple graphics → Sophisticated graphics* *Chronological → Not chronological (e.g., shifts in point of view/flashbacks)*	☐ Narration and/or images have potential to **expand on students' notions of themselves** and their histories. ☐ Narration and/or images have the opportunity to increase **awareness**, **appreciation, and understandings** of historically marginalized communities.	☐ Narration and/or images contribute to **stereotypical beliefs** that have been constructed in society (e.g., gender roles).
Language	☐ Language *Literal → Figurative or ironic* *Clear → Ambiguous* *Conversational/contemporary/familiar* → Unfamiliar/archaic/academic*	☐ Builds **academic language** ☐ Supports **multilingual learners**' leveraging of language resources and connecting to content from the larger topics under study	☐ Language makes **generalizations** or implies something is normal and absolute or a norm for all individuals and/or groups of people. Does not acknowledge or make space for different cultural norms. ☐ Language makes **assumptions** about a specific culture or group of people.
Knowledge	☐ Knowledge *Single themes → Multiple/complex themes* *Single perspectives → Multiple perspectives* *Familiar* knowledge → Specialized knowledge* *Low intertextuality → High intertextuality*	☐ Provides opportunity to **center historically marginalized** identities, experiences, or knowledge ☐ Shows **joy, agency, creativity, or resilience** of historically marginalized identities ☐ Builds knowledge about a **topic, perspective, or event** ☐ Connects to content knowledge of a **unit of study** ☐ Connects to current events or topics that **matter to students**	☐ Focuses **on challenges/obstacles** faced by historically marginalized identities ☐ Portrays characters as **race/culture/identity neutral** or without depth

Reflection/Discussion Notes:

---

* In making determinations about familiarity, consider the students in the room. How much do you know about students' language(s)/language repertoires or knowledge? For whom is language or knowledge familiar? How does this allow you, or not allow you, to center historically and/or currently marginalized students?