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# DRAFT Guidance for Local Instructional Materials Adoptions



Content

[Guidance for Local Instructional Materials Adoptions 1](#_Toc143608084)

[Introduction 4](#_Toc143608085)

[Subject-Matter Toolkits 5](#_Toc143608086)

[Overview of Local Adoption Process (suggested) 7](#_Toc143608087)

[Identifying Instructional Materials to Consider 8](#_Toc143608088)

[State Board of Education-Adopted Instructional Materials 8](#_Toc143608089)

[Instructional Materials Not Reviewed by the State Board of Education 9](#_Toc143608090)

[Benefits of Selecting SBE-Approved Instructional Materials 9](#_Toc143608091)

[Considering Non-SBE Adopted Curricula 10](#_Toc143608092)

[Initial Reviewer Conclusions 11](#_Toc143608093)

[Reviewing Instructional Materials 12](#_Toc143608094)

[Identifying Local Priorities 12](#_Toc143608095)

[Confirming Alignment to California Standards and Guidance 15](#_Toc143608096)

[Reviewer Discussion and Deliberation 19](#_Toc143608097)

[Piloting Instructional Materials 21](#_Toc143608098)

[The Pilot Process 21](#_Toc143608099)

[Before the Pilot 22](#_Toc143608100)

[During the Pilot 26](#_Toc143608101)

[Implementation of Instructional Materials 30](#_Toc143608102)

[Publisher and Content Developer Considerations 30](#_Toc143608103)

[Implementation Plan 31](#_Toc143608104)

[Resources 32](#_Toc143608105)

[Access CDE Resources for Additional Information and Guidance. 32](#_Toc143608106)

[Education Code Citations (not comprehensive) 33](#_Toc143608107)

[Access the Following Resources for Additional Information and Guidance. 34](#_Toc143608108)

[Appendix 36](#_Toc143608109)

[Standards Map Template 37](#_Toc143608110)

[Rating How Instructional Programs Meet Local Priorities 38](#_Toc143608111)

[Rating How Instructional Programs Support Student Subgroups 39](#_Toc143608112)

[Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 1 40](#_Toc143608113)

[Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 2 41](#_Toc143608114)

[Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 3 42](#_Toc143608115)

[Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 4 43](#_Toc143608116)

[Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 5 44](#_Toc143608117)



## Introduction

This document is designed to provide guidance for local educational agencies (LEAs) in identifying, reviewing, piloting, and adopting instructional materials in all academic content areas and draws from a range of resources to support the local adoption process.

California educators familiar with the process of evaluating and selecting standards-aligned instructional materials will recognize much of the content in this guidance document. One important goal of this document is to identify the steps those engaged in reviewing instructional materials on behalf of LEAs can engage in to make these important decisions. The second goal is to include links to the current and relevant resources at each step of the process to facilitate the decision-making processes.

Instructional materials for all subjects should reflect the global context of the twenty-first century and best practices relating to development of curriculum using innovative materials and tools to deliver instruction. These materials are not limited to traditional textbooks, rather they should incorporate digital resources and tools that allow teachers to select from an array of options to best help their students achieve the standards. Likewise, classroom strategies should be dynamic and ever evolving to adapt to these changing technologies. Therefore, evaluations of instructional materials should focus on the evidence that shows how best to teach the standards for each content area, using multi-pronged approaches and methods of delivery to ensure equity and engagement for all students.

The process of selecting and implementing new instructional materials at the local level should be thoroughly planned, publicly conducted, and well documented. LEAs are required to adhere to California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 60002 ([*https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=60002.&lawCode=EDC*](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=60002.&lawCode=EDC)), which states the following: “Each district board shall provide for substantial teacher involvement in the selection of instructional materials and shall promote the involvement of parents and other members of the community in the selection of instructional materials.” A recommended practice is to ensure that the teachers participating in the selection process have experience and expertise in the target content area. In addition, educators with experience and expertise with English learners, students with disabilities, advanced learners, parents, and other groups of students requiring specialized instruction should be included.

### Subject-Matter Toolkits

The California County Superintendents (<https://ccsesa.org/committees/cisc/cisc-public-resources/>) and several of its subcommittees have developed subject-specific instructional materials adoption toolkits. Links to available toolkits are listed below. The resource titled *Selection of Non-SBE Adopted K−12 Instructional Materials: Process Resources and Tools* (<https://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Selection-of-Non-SBE-Adopted-K-12-Materials-11-21-16.pdf>) provides guidance for LEAs considering the adoption of instructional materials the State Board of Education (SBE) has not reviewed or adopted. The above-cited document includes a decision tree designed to clarify crucial decision points. The decision tree may be useful for LEAs considering materials for grades nine through twelve (9−12) or curricula not submitted for SBE review.

#### English Language Arts/Literacy and English Language Development Adoption Toolkit

The English Language Arts/Literacy and English Language Development Adoption Toolkit ([https://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/ELA-ELD-Toolkit-10.06.15.pdf](https://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/ELA-ELD-Toolkit-10.06.15.pdf" \o "English Language Arts/Literacy and English Language Development Adoption Toolkit)) is designed to facilitate the selection of instructional programs for English language arts, designated and integrated English language development, biliteracy language arts, intensive intervention, and specialized English language development.

#### History–Social Science Adoption Toolkit

The History–Social Science Adoption Toolkit (<https://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/HSS-Toolkit-FINAL.pdf>) is designed to facilitate the selection of instructional programs for history–social science.

#### Next Generation Science Standards Toolkit for Instructional Materials Evaluation

The Next Generation Science Standards Toolkit for Instructional Materials Evaluation (<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1-HaYVZ0t2orZ0198SOAi_tpOHv0n0reP>) is designed to facilitate the selection of instructional programs aligned with the Next Generation Science Standards in an intentional, articulated, and comprehensive professional learning process.

#### Health Education Instructional Materials Evaluation Toolkit

The Health Education Instructional Materials Evaluation Toolkit (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1E6jvjfrgrHkbhHgX_kbFZHu-nfux4aqW/view>) is designed to facilitate the selection of instructional programs aligned with the *Health Education Content Standards for California Public Schools*.

#### Selection of Non-SBE Adopted K–12 Instructional Materials: Process Resources and Tools

This resource (<https://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Selection-of-Non-SBE-Adopted-K-12-Materials-11-21-16.pdf>) provides guidance to LEAs who choose to use instructional materials that have not been adopted by the SBE, pursuant to *EC* Section 60210.



## Overview of Local Adoption Process (suggested)

The table below offers recommendations for specific tasks and timelines for significant events during the local adoption process.

Table Suggested Overview of the Local Adoption Process

| **Significant Events** | **Tasks** |
| --- | --- |
| Preparation  (1 month) | * Review SBE and local district policies and timelines regarding instructional materials adoptions and committee formations. * Consider developing a needs assessment. * Review local and state data. * Determinedates for significant steps in the adoption process. |
| Identifying Instructional Materials to Consider  (1 month) | * Consider use of SBE-adopted materials (grades K–8) or and/or non-SBE adopted materials. * Review alignment to California Content standards. * Decideon instructional materials to review. |
| Reviewing Instructional Materials to pilot  (1 month) | * Identify local priorities for subject matter. * Review student performance data. * Review support for student subgroups. * Confirm alignment to California content standards. * Determine evaluation criteria. * Deliberate and select materials for further review/pilot. |
| Piloting Instructional Materials  (2 months) | * Use local priorities to determine the focus of the pilot. * Determine ancillary materials. * Establish a timeline. * Select pilot participants. * Determine evaluation criteria. * Train pilot participants. * Gather feedback from all interest holders. * Make a decision using agreed upon decision-making process. * Request local school board adoption following *EC* and local policies. |
| Implementation  (2 months) | * Communicate with publishers and content developers to solidify delivery of materials, final contract details, and training. * Provide initial professional development. * Implement progress monitoring plan. |

## Identifying Instructional Materials to Consider

### State Board of Education-Adopted Instructional Materials

The SBE has constitutional and statutory authority to adopt instructional materials for kindergarten through grade eight (K–8). *EC* sections 60200–60204 describe the process for the adoption of instructional materials for these grades and mandate that submitted materials be evaluated for consistency with adopted content standards and specific evaluation criteria approved by the SBE. The evaluation criteria are updated with each content area adoption to ensure relevancy and are incorporated into the relevant curriculum frameworks.

*EC* Section 60010(h) defines instructional materials as “all materials that are designed for use by pupils and their teachers as a learning resource and help pupils to acquire facts, skills, or opinions or to develop cognitive processes. Instructional materials may be printed or non-printed, and may include textbooks, technology-based materials, other educational materials, and tests.” The SBE traditionally adopts only basic instructional materials programs––for example, programs that are designed for use by pupils and their teachers as a principal learning resource and meet in organization and content the basic requirements of a full course of study, generally one school year in length.

Under current state law, LEAs—school districts, charter schools, and county offices of education—are not required to purchase state-adopted instructional materials. The state-level adoption process determines whether a publisher’s or content developer’s program has fully addressed all grade-level content standards, as well as the other evaluation criteria, and is not an endorsement of a particular program.

While LEAs are not mandated to utilize SBE-adopted programs, the evaluation criteria utilized by the SBE and its appointed reviewers is comprehensive and rigorous. Accordingly, LEAs should begin their consideration of specific new programs by reviewing the SBE-adopted list, available by subject at the California Department of Education (CDE) website. The links below provide access to the most current SBE-adopted programs for that subject matter and information about the related SBE adoption activities, including formal reports on programs by the individual review panels, the Instructional Quality Commission (IQC), and the SBE, as well as the contact information for publishers.

* Arts Education (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/vp/im/>)
* World Languages (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/fl/im/>)
* Mathematics (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ma/im/>)
* Science (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/sc/im/>)
* English Language Arts (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/im/>)
* History–Social Science (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/hs/im/>)

Because the SBE reviews and adopts instructional materials voluntarily submitted to them for consideration, publishers and other curriculum developers may have additional programs available that were not considered by the SBE.

### Instructional Materials Not Reviewed by the State Board of Education

Pursuant to *EC* Section 60210, LEAs may choose to use instructional materials that are aligned with state academic content standards that have not been adopted by the SBE; however, in that event, the LEA must ensure that a majority of the participants of any review process conducted by the LEA are classroom teachers who are assigned to the subject area or grade level of the materials being reviewed.

For additional guidance on selecting curriculum the SBE has not reviewed, see the resource titled *Selection of* *Non-SBE Adopted K-12 Instructional Materials: Process Resources and Tools* (<https://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Selection-of-Non-SBE-Adopted-K-12-Materials-11-21-16.pdf>).

### Benefits of Selecting SBE-Approved Instructional Materials

What are some advantages of selecting instructional materials the SBE has adopted? One major benefit is the assurance that the SBE process involves procedures calculated to ensure that adopted programs are aligned to the California content standards, Social Content Standards, and guidance in curriculum frameworks. Reviewers will also become familiar with the most current framework for the content area as they ensure the instructional materials they are reviewing align with the spirit and explicit guidance that the framework provides.

A second benefit of selecting SBE-adopted materials is that LEAs are able to access specialized formats at no additional cost. For additional information, see the Clearinghouse for Specialized Media & Technology (CSMT) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/sm/>) web page. The CSMT provides access to state-adopted instructional materials for students who have vision impairments, including blindness, or other print disabilities. The CSMT produces and distributes accessible versions of instructional materials, including textbooks, workbooks, literature books, and other student instructional resources to help students overcome challenges, connect with others, and become independent. Specialized formats of instructional materials, including braille, large print, audio recordings, digital talking books, and electronic files, are available free for teachers and other educators to order or download online through the CSMT.

### Considering Non-SBE Adopted Curricula

What options do LEAs have if the instructional materials the SBE has adopted do not meet their local priorities? When identifying what non-SBE adopted instructional materials may be available, educators may consider approaching publishers or curriculum developers with a set of essential questions. Reviewers may also discuss the appropriateness of consulting sources such as EdReports (<https://www.edreports.org/>) as a means to explore additional, non-SBE adopted instructional programs.

A key question to also ask is, “To what extent are these instructional materials aligned to the current content standards?” If one or more of the reviewers think not all the relevant standards are addressed, consider reaching out to the publisher and request that they identify one or more instances where each of the standards is addressed. This preliminary step may save the review team time and effort as they discern which sets of instructional programs to invest resources to review. Reaching out to publishers provides them with an opportunity to substantiate that the instructional materials they have produced include sufficient content and activities aligned to all the relevant standards. Reviewers then confirm the publishers’ citations. If gaps are identified, this finding should inform their decisions regarding the appropriateness of the instructional materials being reviewed.

A Standards Map Template for this process is provided in the Appendix. The sample below illustrates the general format for the template, which can be provided to publishers or curriculum developers to cite where instructional resources fully address each standard.

Table Standards Map Template

| Standard | Standard Language | Publisher Citations | Met | Not Met | Reviewer Comments, Citations, and Questions |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include standard number.] | [Include the language of corresponding standard.] | [Publisher or curriculum developer provides one or more citations.] | [Check if met.] | [Check if not met.] | [Reviewers use this portion to capture their own comments, citations, or questions.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

In the section that follows, titled Reviewing Instructional Materials, the reviewers will have the opportunity to verify the submitted citations. The citations provided by the publishers or curriculum developers can help reviewers determine which instructional programs under consideration might fully align to the relevant content standards.

### Initial Reviewer Conclusions

LEAs should consider two or three instructional programs for review. Reviewing multiple programs offers an understanding of different instructional approaches, while limiting the number of programs for consideration to two or three will keep the process manageable. Identifying the strongest contenders early in the process can help conserve resources for the steps that follow—reviewing, piloting, and adopting instructional materials. In cases where only one instructional program is a viable option, the steps in the review process remain the same. At any point during this process, reviewers may contact the content leads at their local district offices or county offices of education for support.



## Reviewing Instructional Materials

The overarching goal of reviewing instructional materials is to verify they align to the related content standards as well as to the guidance in the related curriculum framework. Naturally, additional considerations come into play, such as local priorities and the input of teachers and other interested parties.

The recommendations in this section focus on determining and articulating an LEA’s local priorities and verifying that instructional materials under consideration align with the relevant content standards. Several sample tools are included in this section; full versions of each template are available in the Appendix. Note that the toolkits discussed on page 5, in the Subject Matter Toolkits section, provide thorough guidance for select content areas. The samples included here are intended to support reviewers for which no subject matter toolkits have yet been developed.

All the suggested tools are optional and are intended to focus reviewers’ attention on the considerations that matter most in order to maximize reviewers’ use of time. The prompts are designed to encourage discussion and decision-making among the reviewers. At the conclusion of the review process, reviewers should consider selecting two instructional programs to pilot.

### Identifying Local Priorities

#### Student Performance Data

Reviewers can consider student academic outcomes and both the interests and needs of various student populations. Some data sources include the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP), or the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), as well as curriculum-specific assessments and survey data available from research or local sources. In addition, consider what support for distance learning the instructional programs under consideration include. The sample tool that follows is provided to prompt reviewers’ consideration of student performance data and other factors that may matter in determining to what extent instructional materials meet local priorities. A template for this process is included in the Appendix.

Table Rating How Instructional Programs Meet Local Priorities

| Data Source | Priorities | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include data sources relevant to the content, grade level, or student population. Options include the LCAP, CAASPP, CALPADS, or other relevant student performance data.] | [Briefly articulate 2–3 key priorities relevant to this review process.] | [For each priority, indicate the degree to which instructional program A meets expectations. Reviewers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] | [Follow the same approach as for program A. Add more columns if they are needed.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

Reviewers may then discuss and deliberate their ratings. These discussions may result in a consensus to prioritize one or two instructional programs for further, more in-depth review.

To develop a more comprehensive set of goals for English learner students, access the English Learner Roadmap Principles Overview (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ml/rmprinciples.asp>) web page. To establish or refine outcomes intended to equip students with world language skills while also preparing them to succeed in the global economy, access the *Global California 2030* initiative (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ml/documents/globalca2030.pdf>).

#### Digital Learning

An aspect in the design of instructional materials that continues to gain importance is digital learning. To highlight its importance, see the excerpt below from the Digital Learning Integration & Standards Guidance (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/dl/dlintergstdsguidance.asp>).

When used effectively in online (synchronously or asynchronously), hybrid, or face-to-face environments, digital tools can accelerate sound pedagogical practices and facilitate student growth as lifelong, empowered learners. Benefits of strategic technology use to support learning include

1. promoting active student engagement in the learning process;
2. nurturing opportunities for ongoing collaboration with peers, educators, families, and a global community of experts;
3. building on prior knowledge to deeply reinforce essential skills, such as executive functioning, critical thinking and reasoning, creativity, communication, cross-cultural understanding, and decision-making;
4. providing means of authentically connecting students’ learning to the world beyond their physical learning environment; and
5. fostering student agency to set personal learning goals and plans and continuously monitor and evaluate their own progress.

#### Support for Student Subgroups

Inclusion, access, and equity continue to guide important decisions among California educators. Beyond ensuring instructional materials fully address all content standards, reviewers can also review materials for the support they provide for students and teachers. Consider, for instance, the support and strategies the instructional programs include for designated and integrated ELD or to what extent the materials might appeal to students’ culture and perspectives. The sample tool that follows is provided to prompt reviewers’ consideration of the degree to which the instructional materials under review include teaching suggestions, specially designed activities and other materials for students, or any other support for that may benefit some student. A template for this process is included in the Appendix.

Table Rating How Instructional Programs Support Student Subgroups

| Student Subgroup | Priorities | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include subgroups of student populations whose academic and other needs may require special consideration. Options include English learners, newcomers, students with special needs, and advanced students, among other possibilities.] | [Briefly articulate key priorities for student subgroups.] | [For each priority, indicate the degree to which instructional program A meets expectations. Reviewers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] | [Follow the same approach as for program A. Add more columns if they are needed.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

Reviewers should discuss their ratings within the group as they ascertain which instructional programs best match their local priorities.

### Confirming Alignment to California Standards and Guidance

#### Content Standards

In the process for considering and adopting instructional materials, California educators should serve as reviewers to conduct the initial analysis of instructional materials publishers choose to submit. The primary and most consequential determination reviewers make is whether alignment to all relevant content standards is evident in the instructional programs they review.

The Identifying Instructional Materials to Consider section guides reviewers to contact publishers or content developers to request that they identify one or more instances where each of the standards is addressed. The next step is for the team of reviewers to verify the citations the publishers or curriculum developers submitted.

It is possible that the submitted citations only partially address a given standard. Part of the responsibility of the reviewers is to conduct a search elsewhere to verify that all aspects of each standard is addressed. As reviewers verify that each of the standards is addressed, they can indicate that in the template titled Standards Map Template, in the column titled Met. If one or more of the reviewers conclude that a standard is not adequately addressed, this can be noted in the column titled Not Met, as well as capturing this finding in the column titled Reviewer Comments, Citations, and Questions.

As a reminder, a sample is included below. The full version of the Standards Map Template is available in the Appendix.

Table Standards Map Template

| Standard | Standard Language | Publisher Citations | Met | Not Met | Reviewer Comments, Citations, and Questions |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include standard number.] | [Include the language of corresponding standard.] | [Publisher or curriculum developer provides one or more citations.] | [Check if met.] | [Check if not met.] | [Reviewers use this portion to capture their own comments, citations, or questions.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

For context, in the SBE instructional materials evaluation and adoption process (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/cefimadoptprocess.asp>), reviewers have opportunities to bring up concerns with publishers, who then have multiple opportunities to respond to questions and address concerns. Reviewers prepare a report of findings for the IQC (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cd/>) to either recommend or not recommend individual instructional programs for SBE adoption. Subject Matter Committee members of the IQC conduct an additional review based on the reports of findings. The IQC makes their own recommendations to the SBE, who has the final authority to adopt instructional materials.

At the local school and district level, reviewers should engage in discussions with publishers. If one or more of the reviewers conclude that the standards are not addressed, consider reaching out to the publisher and request they identify one or more instances where the standards are addressed. This may include addressing individual standards or groupings of related standards. Once reviewers are satisfied that all standards are addressed, they can move on to reviewing the instructional materials for alignment to the evaluation criteria found in the corresponding curriculum framework. In the case where no curriculum framework exists, such as for model curricula (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/modelcurriculumprojects.asp>) or certain subject areas, review instructional materials based on available curriculum guidelines, principles, or goals. It is important to evaluate materials for alignment to the state curriculum framework, model curricula, or other guidance.

#### Evaluation Criteria

Because the SBE adopts instructional materials only for use by students in K−8, LEAs have the sole responsibility and authority to adopt instructional materials for use by students in transitional kindergarten and grades 9−12. Furthermore, if an LEA chooses to use instructional materials that are not adopted by the SBE, it is their responsibility to adopt resources that are aligned to the standards, meet the requirements for social content, best meet the needs of its students, and contain practices that have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness. As defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act, an evidence-based practice is an activity, strategy, or intervention that “demonstrates a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes” based on evidence supported by data, repeatedly tested, and reproducible.

Curriculum frameworks typically include a chapter dedicated to providing guidance on the selection of instructional materials. Importantly, this chapter includes the evaluation criteria for the SBE adoption of instructional materials for students in K–8; guidance for local districts on the adoption of instructional materials for students in grades 9–12; and information regarding the social content review process, supplemental instructional materials, and accessible instructional materials.

At the state level, the instructional materials review process is guided by evaluation criteria consistent with *EC* sections 60200 and 60204, which, generally speaking, require that evaluation criteria be organized within five categories. When considering instructional materials, reviewers first ensure all criteria in Category 1 are fully met. For the remaining categories, reviewers ensure there are strengths evident in the instructional materials under consideration.

##### Category 1: Alignment with the Standards

Instructional materials support teaching and learning of the skills and knowledge called for within the relevant content standards and are appropriate for designated grade levels.

##### Category 2: Program Organization

Instructional resources support instruction and learning of the relevant content standards and include such features as the organization, coherence, and design of the program; chapter, unit, and lesson overviews; and glossaries.

##### Category 3: Assessment

Instructional resources include multiple models of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment tasks for measuring what students know and are able to do and provide guidance for teachers on how to interpret assessment results to guide instruction.

##### Category 4: Access and Equity

The instructional programs under consideration ensure universal and equitable access to high-quality curriculum and instruction for all students so they can meet or exceed the knowledge and skills described in the relevant standards.

##### Category 5: Instructional Planning and Support

The information and resources should present explicit, coherent guidelines for teachers to follow when planning instruction and be designed to help teachers provide effective standards-based instruction.

The five categories in the criteria are an appropriate lens that reviewers can use as they assess the suitability of instructional materials for adoption. The sample tool that follows shows only Category 1. Templates for all five categories are included in the Appendix. These tools are provided to aid in reviewers’ consideration of the degree to which the instructional materials under review address each of the five categories.

Table Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 1

| Criteria in Category 1 | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Include criterion 1 for Category 1: alignment to relevant content standards.] | [For each criterion, indicate the degree to which instructional program A meets expectations. Reviewers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] | [Follow the same approach as for program A. Add more columns if they are needed.  Reviewers can also capture their own comments, citations, or questions in preparation for discussions and deliberation.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

#### Social Content Standards

The social content review (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/lc.asp>) is conducted to ensure that all instructional resources used in California public schools comply with *EC* sections 60040–60044 as well as SBE guidelines contained in Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content ([*https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/socialcontent2013.doc*](https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/socialcontent2013.doc)). In California, instructional resources not in compliance with the Social Content Standards are typically required to be revised or withdrawn. (Note: *EC* Section 60047 [2019] [<https://law.justia.com/citations.html>], in limited circumstances, allows for an LEA to use non-compliant material “but only for that academic year.”) For SBE-adopted instructional materials, the CDE conducts social content compliance reviews. School districts may also conduct their own reviews.

These statutes and guidelines have been enacted so that instructional materials used in California

* portray accurately and equitably the cultural and racial diversity of American society;
* demonstrate the contribution of minority groups and males and females to the development of California and the United States;
* emphasize people in varied, positive, and contributing roles in order to influence students' school experiences constructively; and
* do not contain inappropriate references to commercial brand names, products, and corporate or company logos.

Reviewers have a choice to access the Social Content Standards on a web page (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/abridgedsocialcontent.asp>) or as a Word document (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/socialcontentstdabridged.doc>).

### Reviewer Discussion and Deliberation

After rating and discussing the extent to which the instructional programs under review align with local priorities, content standards, evaluation criteria, and social content standards, reviewers are encouraged to pause and deliberate whether they are ready to decide which instructional materials to pilot. The recommendation is to pilot no more than two different sets of instructional materials, as it may be challenging to adequately monitor and support piloting more than two instructional programs simultaneously. If any questions arise, reviewers may contact the content leads at their local district offices or county offices of education for support.



## Piloting Instructional Materials

This section contains guidance for a thorough pilot process in the form of a field test. A field test is a thorough pilot of the instructional programs under consideration at the local level and are outlined in detail in this guidance. Although a field test may provide the most thorough examination, alternative review options are discussed at the end of the section.

### The Pilot Process

#### Field Test

The most comprehensive option for piloting instructional materials is through a field test. The piloting process allows for the materials selected to be reviewed and evaluated by a representative group of teachers and students in the classroom for an extended period of time, which can carry considerable influence during the decision-making process.

Being mindful of *EC* Section 60002 (<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=60002.&lawCode=EDC>), an effective pilot can

* confirm that all standards are fully addressed;
* provide substantial teacher involvement in evaluation of the components of the materials;
* allow teachers to experience the organization of the program materials, assessments, and range of instructional strategies;
* determine the effectiveness of the materials in providing access to the standards for all students; and
* promote the involvement of parents and other members of the community.

### Before the Pilot

#### Narrow the Focus

Before beginning the field test, LEAs can ensure that there is a clear focus for the field test. The following are considerations as LEAs look to narrow the focus of the pilot study.

1. Carefully consider district and school priorities to determine which components of the materials will be the focus. This can include considering the strengths and potential gaps of the current curriculum adopted by the district. LEAs may choose to survey students, families, school leadership, and teachers as an audit of their current program and what they would like to see in a future program.
2. Establish a timeline for the pilot.
   1. It is recommended that all participating teachers pilot each of the instructional programs under consideration. For example, participating teachers may field test each program for seven weeks. Allowing each teacher to pilot each of the competing programs allows for a more complete discussion of the benefits and potential gaps of the programs.
   2. It is recommended that teachers and adoption committees examine the scope and sequence of each program and compare with the timeline of the current adopted curriculum and standards. This ensures that the pilot process does not interfere with students receiving the instruction necessary to meet the standards at the end of the school year. When the pilot begins, participants should understand which units of each program will be piloted and at what time during the process.
3. Determine which ancillary materials will be evaluated during the pilot process. Ensure that teachers are comparing similar components of competing programs (e.g., intervention materials, English learner support, digital resources).

#### Select Pilot Participants

A strategic and intentional selection of teacher participants can ensure that results from the field test reflect the students and teachers who will use the selected instructional program adopted at the end of the process. The following considerations may guide the selection of participants:

* When recruiting teachers, provide potential participants with all timelines and expectations of the pilot process. Provide meeting times, training schedules, feedback expectations, and timelines for the field test.
* Choose a variety of classrooms and schools that are representative of the students and classrooms that will be using the adopted materials. Consider grade bands, schools with a variety of performance levels using data from district and statewide assessments, number of English learners, students with disabilities, experience level of teachers, and any other district priorities that will inform the final decision and will be reflective of district goals.
* When considering materials in additional languages, it is recommended that teachers who are fluent in the target language participate in the pilot process.

#### Evaluation Criteria

LEAs, adoption committees, and others involved in piloting instructional materials can work to determine the evaluation criteria that participants will use, considering the goals of the pilot process and ensuring they are captured in the evaluation criteria. Participants should understand the specific features they are looking for and how that evidence will be collected. LEAs may consider collecting data on ease of use, student performance, program components and student feedback. Creating these evaluations before the pilot process ensures participating teachers understand the focus of their field test, how the evaluations will be collected, and how often they will give feedback during the field test.

There are various methods for collecting this data. Districts may choose to conduct surveys through digital platforms such as Google Forms and use interactive slides, paper rating scales, etc.

Below are sample questions and ratings for participating teachers and students that LEAs may consider when creating evaluation tools. The criteria may vary based on the content area as well as the focus of the pilot study.

Table Sample Questions and Ratings for Teachers

| Sample Questions and Ratings | Teachers’ Responses |
| --- | --- |
| Rate the ease of use in planning for the week. | [For each criterion, indicate the degree to which the instructional program meets expectations. Teachers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] |
| How well did your students achieve your learning targets for the week? | [Continue from above.] |
| How well did the program provide strategies for teaching a range of learners? | [Continue from above.] |
| How well did the lessons support English Learners in your classroom? | [Continue from above.] |
| How well did the lessons support students with disabilities in your classroom? | [Continue from above.] |
| Did the program provide adequate guidance for integrated English Language Development? | [Continue from above.] |
| What feedback did families have during your weekly lessons? | [Continue from above.] |
| How well did the lessons support acceleration in your classroom? | [Continue from above.] |
| How satisfied were you with the intervention pieces in the program? | [Continue from above.] |
| Rate the ease of use of the student technology platform. | [Continue from above.] |

LEAs are encouraged to put the experience of students at the forefront of the process, both in the academic assessment data as well as their experience as a learner while interacting with the programs. Below are sample questions that can be used to gather student feedback during a pilot process.

Table Sample Questions and Ratings for Students

| Sample Questions and Ratings | Student Responses |
| --- | --- |
| How would you rate the technology component of the program? | [For each criterion, indicate the degree to which the instructional program meets expectations. Students can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] |
| Think about a lesson your teacher taught recently. How interested were you in the lesson? | [Continue from above] |
| How well did the lessons prepare you for the assessments? | [Continue from above] |
| What is something you like about the program? | [Continue from above] |
| What is something you do not like about the program? | [Continue from above] |

#### Training

Districts should fully train all participants in the pilot process and all instructional program materials. Initial training may be led by the publishers of the materials. LEAs may consider asking the publisher to provide an overview of all components of the program, provide sample lesson plans, and model lessons in classrooms. The goal of training is to ensure that all participants will be teaching the programs in a similar fashion, allowing student and teacher data to be relatable. Participants should know and understand the evaluation tools and how often they are expected to give feedback, as well as who they should contact should questions arise.

### During the Pilot

#### Pilot Participants

During the piloting stage, teachers and students actively engage with the curriculum. Teachers plan and deliver lessons and gather information through formal and informal assessments. LEAs and adoption committees are encouraged to collect data and feedback regularly using the evaluation criteria determined in the planning process. During the process, participating teachers may meet in groups to calibrate data and compare experiences. Group meetings can be beneficial for teachers to discuss program effectiveness in their classrooms and grade levels. LEAs may use this feedback in discussions with publishers and content developers to assist in making final decisions. They may also request that publishers and content developers provide additional training to teachers during the pilot or after the adoption process.

#### Other Feedback

LEAs can use the time to gather information from those not directly piloting the materials in classrooms. Information can be gathered from various interest groups including, but not limited to the following:

* District leadership
* Site administrators
* English learner advisory committees
* Equity committees
* District advisory committees
* Parents and guardians
* Teachers not participating in the pilot process

Feedback can be gathered using a variety of methods depending on the focus group. LEAs may have materials, both digital and print, available during open hours in a public location such as the district headquarters. Families and community members can take time to review the materials and complete surveys or use other methods to provide input. LEAs may also use this time to hold information meetings with interested groups to solicit feedback on the programs being reviewed.

Engaging parents and the broader community during the pilot can give a voice to those supporting students with the curriculum and can build trust with a transparent process.

Below are sample questions that can be used for community members.

Table Sample Questions and Ratings for Community Members

| Sample Questions and Ratings | Community Member Responses |
| --- | --- |
| How well does the program provide a balanced portrayal of various demographic, familial, and personal characteristics? | [For each criterion, indicate the degree to which the instructional program meets expectations. Community members can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] |
| How well does the program provide support for home/school communication? | [Continue from above] |
| Rate the ease of use of the technology components. | [Continue from above] |
| How well do the secondary language components align with the scope and rigor of the original program? | [Continue from above] |

#### Adoption: Making a Decision

Throughout the pilot process, data has been collected from various sources. Before making a final decision, it is recommended that LEAs compile all data from participating teachers, district leaders, students, families, and community members, as well as any assessment data.

Final decision making can be accomplished in various ways. It is recommended that methods be discussed with participants prior to the pilot. Adoption committees may consider reaching consensus to support final decision making.

Consensus is a process in which committees agree that the will of the group drives the decision making. In this process, each participant agrees that they can support the program ultimately recommended by the party and that each team member has a responsibility to support the adoption and implementation throughout the district. LEAs may choose to begin with a vote. If the decision is not clear, a neutral facilitator can lead discussion and move the process forward.

#### Alternative Review Options

Although a full pilot process may be the most comprehensive, there are alternative review options listed below.

*Teacher Analysis of Similar Lessons*. In this process, teachers compare lessons in each instructional program. Participants duplicate a similar lesson from each program and hide/cover the name of the publisher (if possible). Teachers analyze each lesson, considering strengths and areas for growth. Taking into consideration district priorities, participants compare the instructional programs and determine which one they would recommend for adoption based on the lesson analyses.

1. Student Survey of Program. To gather additional information in the form of student data, a similar lesson for each instructional program under consideration is delivered to a group of students. Students are placed in groups to review the lessons and respond to survey questions. Below is a sample process from the History–Social Science Toolkit.

Directions for Teachers

* Teach a lesson from one of the programs under consideration.
* Students may work individually or in small groups of three or four.
* Following the lesson, students work individually or in small groups to answer the survey questions.
* Set guidelines for group discussion allowing students to take turns discussing and answering questions about the lesson.
* Students rate the lesson using the questions and rating scale below. Consider using an electronic data collection tool.
* Repeat the process for the other program under consideration.

Directions for Students

Look through the student edition of the instructional materials and reflect on the lesson taught. Answer the following questions:

* Was the lesson interesting and engaging?
* Was the text easy, just right, or too difficult?
* Describe what you learned from the lesson.
* Describe the features of the lesson that helped you learn.
* Was there anything you didn’t like in the lesson? If so, describe.
* Rate the lesson from 1–4
  + 1: Not very good
  + 2: Just okay
  + 3: Good
  + 4: Excellent

1. *Executive Committee Review*.In this process, the executive committee for the LEA conducts any additional reviews of the instructional programs and determines the best match with the district lens in mind.

Further guidance on these processes can be found in each of the subject matter toolkits linked in the Resources section.

#### School Board Considerations

Once reviewers have made a decision, LEA staff recommends an instructional program to the local governing board for adoption. Procedures should follow current *EC* as well as the LEA board policies and administrative regulations. The public meeting of the local board considering the instructional materials adoption should be governed by the usual notification and public access rules for all governing board meetings, per *EC* sections 35140–35149 (<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?division=3.&chapter=2.&part=21.&lawCode=EDC&title=2.&article=3>) and the Brown Act (Government Code Section 54950 [<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?division=2.&chapter=9.&part=1.&lawCode=GOV&title=5>]).



## Implementation of Instructional Materials

The final adoption decision is a significant milestone in the process. Following this adoption decision, a carefully considered implementation plan supports LEAs in achieving the goals set forth at the beginning of the adoption process. The plan can include delivery of materials and professional learning.

### Publisher and Content Developer Considerations

Communication with the selected publisher and/or content developers can ensure that delivery of program materials and potential training is finalized as the process moves into the implementation phase.

* Delivery of materials. Ensure that all components for delivery are discussed, including timelines and publisher and/or content developer responsibilities in this process. LEAs should also consider timelines for delivery to sites, library coding, and delivery to classrooms and teachers. Districts should be mindful of instructional materials sufficiency law (*EC* Section 60119), which requires LEAs to ensure that all pupils have standards-aligned instructional materials to use in class and to take home.
* Access to online portals/digital content. Finalize information for online and digital access by teachers, district leaders, instructional coaches, and other district personnel who will be utilizing the content. Consider how users will gain access to the materials, including obtaining login credentials. The same considerations should be made for student access when appropriate.
* Training schedules. LEAs may consider when and how professional learning will occur. Teachers may benefit from professional learning that occurs before the school year begins, as well as ongoing opportunities throughout the school year.
* Continuation of materials. LEAs should include within purchasing contracts all potential costs beyond the first year of program delivery and implementation, such as the cost of consumables and continuing deliveries. Note that the CDE online pricelist identifies delivery costs for SBE-adopted materials. Consideration should be made as to which materials are consumable and must be refreshed yearly.

### Implementation Plan

A thoughtful implementation plan supports teacher knowledge and enthusiasm but also ensures that all classroom teachers understand the new materials and the shifts in pedagogy, and feel prepared to begin using the new curriculum to its fullest and best capacity. Professional learning, feedback systems, progress monitoring, and assessments of student progress are considerations for an implementation plan.

#### Professional Learning

Pre-service professional development provided by the publishers and/or content developers allows for instructional materials training in district-wide or school-wide forums before the materials will be utilized in classrooms. This will familiarize all staff, including school administrators and district leaders, with the program and its components. Publishers and/or content developers can be available to answer questions, walk through model lessons, and describe the use of ancillary materials. Following this initial professional development with ongoing and sustained professional learning will provide support to teachers implementing new instructional materials in real time. Publishers and/or content developers, district and school coaches, and/or teachers experienced with the program may support this ongoing training. Ongoing professional learning can be adjusted to respond to teacher input and specific requests as questions or challenges arise and as student outcomes are evaluated.

#### Assessment

Many LEAs provide district-wide assessments at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year. It may be advisable to compare the scope and sequence of the new curriculum with the current assessments to determine if any adjustments need to be made due to a variation in timeline for standards being introduced in the new curriculum.

#### Progress Monitoring

Continuous progress monitoring after the initial implementation of a new instructional program helps LEAs, schools, and teachers using the materials to understand the effectiveness of the materials in meeting district goals. LEAs can use assessments as mentioned above to monitor student progress or consider monitoring feedback from teachers, students, and community members to develop professional learning opportunities.



## Resources

### Access CDE Resources for Additional Information and Guidance.

* California Content Standards: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/index.asp>
* California Curriculum Frameworks: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/allfwks.asp>
* Clearinghouse for Specialized Media & Technology: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/sm/>
* Current SBE-adopted programs
  + Arts Education: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/vp/im/>
  + World Languages: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/fl/im/>
  + Mathematics: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ma/im/>
  + Science: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/sc/im/>
  + English Language Arts: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/im/>
  + History–Social Science: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/hs/im/>
* Digital Learning Integration & Standards Guidance: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/dl/dlintergstdsguidance.asp>
* English Learner Roadmap Principles Overview: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ml/rmprinciples.asp>
* *Global California 2030 Speak. Learn. Lead.*: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ml/documents/globalca2030.pdf>
* Implementation of Instructional Materials Not Adopted by California: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/im/implementofimsnotadopt.asp>
* Instructional Materials Evaluation and Adoption Process: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/cefimadoptprocess.asp>
* Instructional Materials Frequently Asked Questions: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/imfrpfaq1.asp>
* Instructional Materials Ordering and Distribution System: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/sm/cefcsmt.asp>
* Instructional Quality Commission: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cd/>
* Model Curriculum Projects: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/modelcurriculumprojects.asp>
* Price List of Adopted Instructional Materials: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/intro-plsearch.asp>
* Social Content Standards: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/abridgedsocialcontent.asp>
* Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/socialcontent2013.doc>
* Universal Prekindergarten Frequently Asked Questions: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/em/kinderfaq.asp>

### Education Code Citations (not comprehensive)

California Constitution, Article IX, Section 7.5. Regarding the SBE adoption of instructional materials for use in grades one through eight: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=60200.&lawCode=EDC>

*EC* Section 240. Regarding local board adoption of instructional materials: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=240&lawCode=EDC>

*EC* sections 35140–35149. Regarding local school board meetings: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?division=3.&chapter=2.&part=21.&lawCode=EDC&title=2.&article=3>

*EC* Section 51050. Regarding local school board enforcement of the use of textbooks and other instructional materials prescribed and adopted by the proper authority: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=51050.&lawCode=EDC>

*EC* sections 51100–51102. Regarding the rights of parents and guardians: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?division=4.&chapter=1.5.&part=28.&lawCode=EDC&title=2.&article=1>

*EC* sections 52060–52077. Regarding LCAP requirements for instructional materials sufficiency: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?division=4.&chapter=6.1.&part=28.&lawCode=EDC&title=2.&article=4.5>

*EC* sections 60040–60045 and 60048. Regarding Social Content: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?division=4.&chapter=1.&part=33.&lawCode=EDC&title=2.&article=3>

*EC* Section 60119. Regarding instructional materials sufficiency: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=60119.&lawCode=EDC>

*EC* Section 60200. Regarding instructional materials adoptions: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=60200.&lawCode=EDC>

*EC* Section 60002. Regarding teacher, parent, and other members of the community participation in the selection of instructional materials: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=60002.&lawCode=EDC>

*EC* Section 60210. Regarding use of instructional materials not adopted by the SBE: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=60210.&lawCode=EDC>

### Access the Following Resources for Additional Information and Guidance.

* California English Learner Roadmap: An Elementary School Teacher Toolkit: <https://californianstogether.box.com/shared/static/nr7ru78i3yjojmhtail8phl3ypchizlm.pdf>
* California English Learner Roadmap: A High School Teacher Toolkit: <https://californianstogether.box.com/shared/static/0pyr6re7ox5jbf53a5dr3aiq10vlm9j3.pdf>
* California English Learner Roadmap: A Middle School Teacher Toolkit: <https://californianstogether.box.com/shared/static/hrdz6bk6y1peth6s4dn6a7hk057l7g10.pdf>
* EdReports: <https://www.edreports.org/>
* English Language Arts/Literacy and English Language Development Adoption Toolkit: <https://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/ELA-ELD-Toolkit-10.06.15.pdf>
* History–Social Science Adoption Toolkit: <https://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/HSS-Toolkit-FINAL.pdf>
* Next Generation Science Standards Toolkit for Instructional Materials Evaluation: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1-HaYVZ0t2orZ0198SOAi_tpOHv0n0reP>
* Non-SBE Adopted K–12 Instructional Materials: Process Resources and Tools: <https://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Selection-of-Non-SBE-Adopted-K-12-Materials-11-21-16.pdf>
* Transitional Kindergarten Implementation Guide: A Resource for California Public School District Administrators and Teachers: <https://cpin.us/sites/default/files/TK/tkguide.pdf>



## Appendix

Throughout this document, samples of tools were included to illustrate processes educators could use in their work of reviewing instructional materials. Editable versions are included in this appendix.

### Standards Map Template

| Standard | Standard Language | Publisher Citations | Met | Not Met | Reviewer Comments, Citations, and Questions |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include standard number.] | [Include the language of corresponding standard.] | [Publisher or curriculum developer provides one or more citations.] | [Check if met.] | [Check if not met.] | [Reviewers use this portion to capture their own comments, citations, or questions.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

### Rating How Instructional Programs Meet Local Priorities

| Data Source | Priorities | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include data sources relevant to the content, grade level, or student population. Options include the LCAP, CAASPP, CALPADS, or other relevant student performance data.] | [Briefly articulate 2–3 key priorities relevant to this review process.] | [For each priority, indicate the degree to which instructional program A meets expectations. Reviewers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] | [Follow the same approach as for program A. Add more columns if they are needed.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

### Rating How Instructional Programs Support Student Subgroups

| Student Subgroup | Priorities | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include subgroups of student populations whose academic and other needs may require special consideration. This may include English learners, newcomers, students with special needs, and advanced students..] | [Briefly articulate key priorities for student subgroups.] | [For each priority, indicate the degree to which instructional program A meets expectations. Reviewers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] | [Follow the same approach as for program A. Add more columns if they are needed.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

### Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 1

| Criteria in Category 1 | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Include criterion 1 for Category 1: Alignment to Standards.] | [For each criterion, indicate the degree to which instructional program A meets expectations. Reviewers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] | [Follow the same approach as for program A. Add more columns if they are needed.  Reviewers can also capture their own comments, citations, or questions in preparation for discussions and deliberation.] |
| [Include criterion 2.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 3.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 4.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 5.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 6.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 7.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 8.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

### Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 2

| Criteria in Category 2 | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Include criterion 1 for Category 2: Program Organization.] | [For each criterion, indicate the degree to which instructional program A meets expectations. Reviewers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] | [Follow the same approach as for program A. Add more columns if they are needed.  Reviewers can also capture their own comments, citations, or questions in preparation for discussions and deliberation.] |
| [Include criterion 2.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 3.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 4.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 5.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 6.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 7.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 8.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 9.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 10.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 11.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

### Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 3

| Criteria in Category 3 | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Include criterion 1 for Category 3: Assessment.] | [For each criterion, indicate the degree to which instructional program A meets expectations. Reviewers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] | [Follow the same approach as for program A. Add more columns if they are needed.  Reviewers can also capture their own comments, citations, or questions in preparation for discussions and deliberation.] |
| [Include criterion 2.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 3.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 4.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 5.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 6.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

### Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 4

| Criteria in Category 4 | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Include criterion 1 for Category 4: Access and Equity.] | [For each criterion, indicate the degree to which instructional program A meets expectations. Reviewers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] | [Follow the same approach as for program A. Add more columns if they are needed.  Reviewers can also capture their own comments, citations, or questions in preparation for discussions and deliberation.] |
| [Include criterion 2.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 3.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 4.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 5.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 6.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 7.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 8.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 9.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

### Rating Alignment to Evaluation Criteria in Category 5

| Criteria in Category 5 | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Include criterion 1 for Category 5: Instructional Planning and Support.] | [For each criterion, indicate the degree to which instructional program A meets expectations. Reviewers can rate each program by assigning points. Example:  1 point: Minimal  2 points: Adequate  3 points: Strong] | [Follow the same approach as for program A. Add more columns if they are needed.  Reviewers can also capture their own comments, citations, or questions in preparation for discussions and deliberation.] |
| [Include criterion 2.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 3.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 4.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 5.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 6.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 7.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 8.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 9.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 10.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| [Include criterion 11.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
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