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## 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 the 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. Similarly, classroom strategies should be dynamic and evolving to adapt to changing technologies. Consequently, the evaluation 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 access, equity, engagement, and success 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 learner (EL) students, 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 currently available toolkits are listed below and new ones are added with each content-specific state-level adoption.

#### 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

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 instructional materials for grades nine through twelve (9−12) or instructional materials not submitted for SBE review.

### Clarifying the Purpose and Expectations of Review Panels

The process of selecting instructional materials at the LEA level usually begins with the appointment of a committee of educators, including teachers and curriculum specialists, and possibly students, who determine what instructional materials are needed, develop evaluation criteria and rubrics for reviewing materials, and establish a review process that involves teachers and content-area experts on review committees. After the review panel develops a list of instructional materials that are being considered for adoption, the next step is to pilot the instructional materials. An effective piloting process helps determine if the materials provide teachers with the resources necessary to implement an instructional program based on the California standards.

The primary role of an instructional materials review panel is to determine to what extent the materials under consideration

* align with the relevant SBE-adopted content standards;
* align to the guidance and evaluation criteria in the relevant curriculum framework; and
* adhere to the California Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content*,* 2013 Edition (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/socialcontent2013.doc>).

The standards for every academic content area state what students are expected to know and be able to do. The state-developed standards document and the corresponding curriculum framework detail novel priorities or instructional shifts as well as guidance for evaluating instructional materials at the local level. Each content-specific framework has a chapter dedicated to the criteria that should be considered when adopting instructional materials for that content area. For example, chapter 13 of the 2023 *Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* (*Mathematics Framework*) details all the criteria important to consider when adopting instructional materials for mathematics. The Curriculum and Instruction Subject Areas web page contains links to current standards, frameworks, and other resources for all content areas (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/cimegasubjectareas.asp>). Gaining a deep understanding of these documents is an essential first step for panel members as they begin the instructional materials review and selection process.

When establishing an instructional materials review panel, LEAs may consider the following suggestions that may promote the review panel’s success:

1. Invite individuals with expertise in the review process to provide initial training.
2. Select one or more facilitators to guide the process.
3. Convene panelists who
   1. have expertise in the content area under consideration;
   2. are a majority of teachers with substantial experience in the classroom and teachers relatively new to the profession;
   3. have knowledge or experience with effective and promising instructional practices;
   4. have expertise with student groups such as EL students and students with disabilities; and
   5. have knowledge or experience collecting or analyzing student data.
4. Develop and share with the review panel a plan that shows the steps from training to reviewing to adopting instructional materials.

The table below includes some recommended tasks for significant events during the local review, piloting, and adoption process.

**Note:** The timeframes are suggested; LEAs should adjust them to better achieve local priorities.

#### Figure 1: Suggested Overview of the Local Adoption Process

| **Significant Events** | **Tasks** |
| --- | --- |
| Preparation  (1–2 months) | * Provide initial training and ongoing support to the reviewers and all participants involved in the review process. * Review legislative, SBE, and local policies and timelines regarding instructional materials adoptions and committee formations. * Review the SBE- or LEA-adopted grade-level content standards for the specific subject area under consideration, if available. * Review guidance for implementing the relevant content standards in the most recent SBE-approved curriculum framework, if available. * Review criteria for evaluation of instructional resources as outlined in the most recent SBE-approved curriculum framework for the subject area under consideration, if available. * Review results from LEA assessments in the content area for which materials are being adopted. * Review local and state data, including the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). * Develop a needs assessment. * Determinedates for significant steps in the review, piloting, and adoption process. |
| Identifying Instructional Materials to Consider  (1–2 months) | * Consider SBE-adopted instructional materials (kindergarten through grade eight [K–8]) or non-SBE adopted instructional materials. * Determine which instructional materials the panel will review. |
| Reviewing Instructional Materials to pilot  (1–2 months) | * Identify local priorities for subject matter. * Review student performance data. * Review support for student groups. * Confirm alignment to California content standards. * Review for alignment to evaluation criteria in the curriculum framework. * Review for alignment to social content standards. * Deliberate and select materials for further review/pilot. |
| Piloting Instructional Materials  (2–3 months) | * Use local priorities to determine the focus of the pilot. * Determine which ancillary or supplementary materials will be reviewed during the pilot. * Establish a timeline. * Select pilot participants. * Determine evaluation criteria based on local priorities. * Train pilot participants. * Gather feedback from all interest-holders. * Make a determination using an agreed-upon decision-making process. * Request local school board adoption following *EC* and local policies. |
| Initial Implementation  (2–4 months) | * Communicate with publishers and content developers regarding the delivery of materials, final contract details, and training. * Provide initial professional development for teachers. * Implement progress monitoring plan. |

To prepare for a successful instructional review process, a review panel facilitator should be identified to fulfill several essential roles. One of those roles is to establish communication with publisher and content developer representatives. An important reason to engage with publishers or content developers early in the process is to request that they identify where in the instructional materials they have aligned the materials to the California content standards, the evaluation criteria in the curriculum framework, and the California *Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content* (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/lc.asp>).

Regarding alignment to the content standards for state-adopted instructional materials, evaluators look for evidence that sufficient content, recommended activities, and targeted support are present to align to the content standards within the context of the guidance in the relevant curriculum framework. The goal is to ensure a conceptually clear and accessible treatment of all major standards within the content area, not to focus on extensive coverage of each substandard or example. This can result in superficial, fragmented treatment of the content that undermines students' deep learning of core concepts. What is most important is the inclusion of a well-defined sequence of instructional opportunities for students to become proficient in the standards. Also, a set of instructional materials may be recommended even when not all components within each evaluation criterion are present, as long as there are strengths evident in each category.

Facilitators or LEA leadership may ask that publishers or content developers complete both the Standards Map (figure 2) and the Evaluation Criteria Map (figure 3). An analysis of this information may expedite initial decisions regarding into which instructional programs LEAs will invest resources.

Tips for success during the instructional materials review process:

* Block out time to conduct the reviews.
* Dedicate a workspace to conduct the reviews.
* Take notes of thought processes when confirming that the standards and other evaluation criteria are met—particularly when there is uncertainty or when the reviewer wants to raise a question for either the publisher, developer, or other reviewers.

Facilitators or those providing professional development to reviewers may engage them in revising or expanding the set of suggestions listed above.

#### Engaging Interested Parties

To promote a welcoming, transparent process, LEAs should provide opportunities for a wide range of interested parties to listen in, speak up to inform needs assessments and local priorities, or express concerns regarding the review process or the instructional materials under consideration. Parents, students, retired teachers, content experts, and other members of the broader school community can be notified of meetings and invited to participate. Participants do not need to have content expertise; they can listen to the proceedings and provide commentary or feedback.

The facilitators, trainer, or LEA leaders can prepare and post agendas, informative handouts, and guidelines for participation. The information accessible can include an overview of the instructional materials review, piloting, and adoption processes. Brief overviews of relevant legislation, in language accessible to a wide range of readers, can also be made available to participants. One example of legislation LEAs can make available is Assembly Bill (AB) 1078 (<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240AB1078>), which emphasizes a pupil's right to share ideas and beliefs and to receive information and knowledge, under the California Constitution.

#### Keeping Track of the Review Panel’s Results

Once the panel has sufficient citations within the Standards Maps and Evaluation Criteria Maps showing how each set of materials under consideration align to the evaluation criteria, reviewers can start the deliberations process.

To ensure the work that the instructional materials review and deliberation process is smooth and productive, facilitators can provide reviewers with benchmark dates to complete the suggested series of tasks listed in the table below.

#### Figure 2: Preparing for Deliberations

| Action | Suggestions |
| --- | --- |
| Verify citations on Standards Maps by [provide target date] | Some reviewers may come across additional, or stronger, examples that publishers or content developers may not have provided. Reviewers can add citations as necessary. |
| Verify citations on Evaluation Criteria Maps by [provide target date] | Some reviewers may come across additional, or stronger, examples that publishers may not have included in the Standards or Evaluation Criteria Maps forms they provide. Reviewers can add citations as necessary. |
| Make note of any social content standards violations by [provide target date] | Remember to cite specific social content standards for each potential finding. |

To support reviewers’ success, facilitators can check in periodically to address questions and to encourage the completion of the tasks mentioned above. Reviewers can submit their findings to the facilitator(s) to compile by the target dates the facilitator(s) provide, and they should keep a copy of their findings and notes for their own reference during deliberations.

As reviewers submit their findings, facilitators can compile all results and prepare them for dissemination or display. Providing easy access to the reviewers’ results can help the reviewer panels move to in-depth discussions early in the process. One approach is to post the results on sticky poster sheets or butcher paper on the walls of the room where deliberations will take place. Another approach is to project the compiled results on a screen or a wall so all participants can see and follow the discussion of each entry in the Standards Map or the Evaluation Criteria Map. A third approach is to compile the results in a spreadsheet. To illustrate what a spreadsheet might look like, see the example below.

#### Figure 3: Sample Summary of Reviewers’ Results

| Standard | Kinder | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Standard 1] | 5:1  [green] | 4:2  [green] | 5:1  [green] | 4:2  [green] | 2:2  [yellow] | 3:3  [yellow] |
| [Standard 2] | 4:2  [green] | 5:0  [green] | 6:0  [green] | 5:1  [green] | 1:4  [red] | 5:1  [green] |
| [Standard 3] | 4:2  [green] | 3:3  [yellow] | 4:2  [green] | 4:2  [green] | NA | 2:4  [red] |
| [Standard 4] | 5:1  [green] | 6:0  [green] | 6:0  [green] | 5:0  [green] | 3:2  [green] | 5:1  [green] |
| [Continue Listing Standards] | 4:1  [green] | 4:2  [green] | 5:1  [green] | 5:1  [green] | 4:1  [green] | 5:1  [green] |

For each set of instructional materials under review, facilitators can compile reviewers’ results for each of the relevant standards or evaluation criteria and for the grade levels under consideration. To illustrate this approach for compiling reviewers’ results, the table includes only kindergarten through grade five. In this sample, there are two numbers separated by a colon. The first number means “Yes, the standard was present.” The second number represents “No, the standard was not present.” That means that for the first standard for kindergarten, five reviewers determined that the standard was present, and one reviewer determined that the standard was not present. Thus, “5:1” can be read as “Five yesses to one no.”

Note that for standard 1 in grade four, only four of the six reviewers submitted their responses. The reasons why some reviewers do not submit a response can include that they ran out of time, or they could not find evidence. By not submitting a response, reviewers are not necessarily indicating that there is no evidence. During deliberations, individual reviewers can express their rationale for their responses as well as their choice not to respond in certain cases.

In this sample, “NA” was placed in some fields to illustrate one way to indicate that a certain standard is not part of a grade. Certain skills, as stated in content standards, may start in kindergarten and end, for instance, in grade two, because that area of knowledge or skill is foundational and students transition to more challenging or complex skills. Facilitators can format the Standards Tally Sheet to accommodate the particular nuances of the relevant content standards as well as edit any criteria maps to reflect the characteristics of each particular content area.

In this sample Standards Tally Sheet, there were six reviewers. In the California Department of Education (CDE) instructional materials review process, the facilitator usually highlights each field with one of three colors to keep track of those standards and grades for which there is consensus and which may require additional attention.

* **Green**: Highlighting a field in green indicates that the majority of the reviewers found that the standard was present. The members of the review panel may wish to discuss their findings if time allows.
* **Yellow**: Highlighting a field in yellow indicated that half of the members of the review panel found sufficient evidence that the standard was met, while the other half did not. Often, members of the review panel who indicated yes can provide examples of where and how a standard was present.
* **Red**: Highlighting a field in red indicates that most of the reviewers concluded that the standard was not present. The facilitator should prioritize these areas to address during deliberations.

During the CDE instructional materials review process, members of the review panel have multiple opportunities to express questions or concerns; publishers and content developers hear those questions or concerns and address them during scheduled public comment. LEAs may wish to designate one or two individuals to compile reviewers’ questions and bring them up to publishers or content developers. During the CDE review process, the publishers’ and content developers’ responses typically suffice to prompt some reviewers to change their minds. A critical role of the facilitator is to encourage and sustain productive dialogue among members of the review panel and between the review panel and publishers or content developers.

### The Importance of Tallying Reviewers’ Findings

The most accurate tally sheet will contain data that reflects all of the reviewers on the panel. It is critical that facilitators have access to this data to prepare a strategy to address items that may require further discussion during deliberations. Facilitators can explain that if a reviewer does not complete the tally, their work will not be accounted for in the compilation of reviewers’ results, and they may have to rely on their notes when engaging in discussions. Incomplete data may ultimately slow down the panel’s progress, as completed tallies help yield initial consensus and provide more time to focus on areas of uncertainty or disagreement.

The citations provided by publishers or content developers are a critical foundation for members of the review panel to determine which instructional programs under consideration align to the relevant content standards, evaluation criteria, and the *Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content*. Ultimately, the main role of reviewers is to verify the citations. If reviewers are unsatisfied, they can explore deeper to locate additional evidence that the instructional program meets standards and evaluation criteria. In some cases, reviewers may disagree that some standards or evaluation criteria are met, so it is important that they document these findings.

Facilitators can remind reviewers that the summary tallies may not reflect their final thoughts or decisions. As discussions progress, reviewers may change their minds on whether instructional materials meet all of the criteria. The initial tallies help the panels prioritize aspects of the instructional program under review they consider most important to discuss and make decisions about. In the section titled Reviewing Instructional Materials, there are suggestions for reviewers to verify the submitted citations.



## Identifying Instructional Materials to Consider

### State Board of Education-Adopted Instructional Materials

The SBE has constitutional and statutory authority to adopt instructional materials for grades 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 the 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 on the 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.

### Benefits of Selecting State Board of Education-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) web page (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/sm/>). 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-State Board of Education Adopted Instructional Materials

What options do LEAs have if the instructional materials the SBE has adopted do not meet their local priorities? 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>). This tool includes a decision tree designed to clarify crucial decision points. The decision tree may be useful for LEAs considering instructional materials for grades 9−12 or instructional materials not submitted for SBE review. The decision tree, included below as figure 4, illustrates in the style of a flowchart the information and suggested actions provided in this document.

#### Figure 4: Instructional Materials Selection Decision Tree



[Text Accessible version of this graphic](#Figure4)

When identifying what non-SBE adopted instructional materials may be available, educators may consider approaching publishers or content developers with a set of essential questions. A key question to also ask is, **“To what extent are these instructional materials aligned to the current content standards and adoption criteria?”** If one or more of the reviewers think not all the relevant standards or criteria have been addressed, consider reaching out to the publisher and request that they identify one or more instances where each of the standards or criterion statements 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 and adoption criteria. 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. 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 Standards Map Template and an Evaluation Criteria Map for this process are 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 address each standard. Naturally, these templates can be modified to align with the structure of specific sets of standards. Figures 11, 12, and 13 illustrate a Standards Map Template aligned to mathematics standards.

#### Figure 5: 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, 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 align to the relevant content standards.

Local leaders should ensure that the instructional materials being considered provide equitable access to all areas of the curriculum for all students. The federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/lr/ideareathztn.asp>) requires an LEA to provide accessible instructional materials to students who need them for participation and achievement. While SBE-adopted materials are available in accessible formats from the CDE, an LEA utilizing non-adopted materials will need to obtain digital files and, if necessary, have them converted to accessible formats, such as braille and large print books.

### 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 with the relevant SBE-adopted content standards, align to the guidance and evaluation criteria in the relevant curriculum framework, and adhere to the California Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content. 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 and other evaluation criteria. Several sample tools are included in this section; full versions of each template are available in the appendix. Note that the toolkits discussed 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 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.

#### Figure 6: 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.

#### 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 Groups

Inclusion, access, and equity continue to guide important decisions among California educators. Beyond ensuring instructional materials align with the relevant content standards and other evaluation criteria, reviewers should 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 that may benefit some students. A template for this process is included in the appendix.

#### Figure 7: Rating How Instructional Programs Support Student Groups

| Student Group | Priorities | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include student populations whose academic and other needs may require special consideration (e.g., EL students, newcomers, students with disabilities, advanced students, etc.] | [Briefly articulate key priorities for student groups.]  Example: Materials include formative assessment of content and language for a range of student groups. | [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.

#### A Focus on Students with Disabilities

Students with Disabilities (SWD) make up a significant percentage of the pre-kindergarten through grade twelve student population in California. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/cefspeced.asp>). Because it is the responsibility of LEAs to provide instruction for SWDs in their least restrictive environment (<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/regs/b/b/300.114>), an important consideration during the instructional materials review process is to evaluate the extent to which core instructional materials provide access to SWDs. For example, this support may be provided through the integration of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles, an approach discussed and recommended in all of California’s instructional frameworks. Additionally, LEAs can evaluate how well instructional methods included in the materials under consideration align with the research on effective instruction for SWDs—as embodied in guidance documents for educators who specifically serve SWDs—such as the California Dyslexia Guidelines (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/documents/cadyslexiaguidelines.pdf>) and California’s Literacy Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations for Education Specialists (<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/literacy-and-reading-instruction>). Reviewing materials through the lens of universal access and research-aligned instructional methods can not only support the success of SWDs, it may also benefit all students.

In the sample below, some basic prompts are provided to guide reviewers as they evaluate how well instructional materials integrate support for SWDs, such as the principles of UDL, instructional methods proven effective for SWDs, or other materials intended to support this student population. A template for this process is included in the appendix.

**Note:** The examples provided are for illustration purposes only. LEAs and instructional materials review panels may develop their own priorities.

#### Figure 8: Rating How Instructional Programs Support Students with Disabilities

| Priorities | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Instructional materials integrate the principles of UDL, including options for Engagement, Representation, and Action and Expression. | [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.] |
| Instructional materials align with research consensus of effective instruction for SWDs. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| Instructional materials include teacher suggestions, ancillary materials, or other support for providing accommodations and/or modifications to the general curriculum for SWDs. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

To develop a more comprehensive set of goals for students with learning difficulties, access the following resources.

* Universal Design for Learning Guidelines (<https://udlguidelines.cast.org/>)
* California Dyslexia Guidelines (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/documents/cadyslexiaguidelines.pdf>)
* Literacy Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations web page (<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/literacy-and-reading-instruction>).
* The California Dyslexia Initiative website (<https://www.scoe.net/divisions/ed_services/curriculum/cadyslexia/>) offers educator resources, including videos, articles, webinars, and professional development modules to foster a deeper understanding of dyslexia and support students with learning difficulties.
* The English Learners with Disabilities web page (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/elpracguideswd.asp>), along with the *California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities* (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/documents/ab2785guide.pdf>), offer information regarding support for educators in the identification, assessment, differentiation of instruction, and reclassification of ELs with disabilities.

#### A Focus on English Learner Students

In California, educators should focus on the ways instructional materials are specially designed to serve EL students. LEAs have a dual obligation to provide all EL students a program designed to 1) overcome language barriers, and 2) provide assistance where the EL student’s equal participation may be compromised because the EL student may not yet be proficient enough to independently access and participate in the instruction. LEAs must design a program of English language development (ELD) that includes both designated and integrated ELD instruction. (Access references to pertinent *EC* and *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5, at the General Requirements for EL Student Programs web page [<https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/co/ca21assuranceelprogram.asp>].) An LEA may determine the sequence and manner in which to meet this dual obligation as long as programs are reasonably calculated to enable students to attain parity of participation in the standard instructional program within a reasonable length of time after they enter the school system.

The sample that follows includes some basic prompts for reviewers to consider when evaluating the degree to which the instructional materials under review include teaching suggestions, specially designed activities and other materials, or any other support that may benefit EL students. A template for this process is included in the appendix.

**Note:** The examples provided are for illustration purposes only. LEAs and instructional materials review panels may develop their own priorities.

#### Figure 9: Rating How Instructional Programs Support English Learners

| Priorities | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Instructional materials include teacher suggestions, ancillary materials, or other support for integrated ELD instruction, including tasks that require students to make meaning through collaboration and by interpreting and producing mathematical language. | [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.] |
| Instructional materials include suggestions, activities, or materials to support students at the Emerging, Expanding, and Bridging levels. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| Instructional materials include teacher suggestions, ancillary materials, or other support for designated ELD instruction. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

The *California English Language Development Standards* (*ELD Standards*) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/eldstndspublication14.pdf>) provide guidance regarding what EL students may be able to do at the Emerging, Expanding, and Bridging levels. The English Language Development Standardsweb page (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/eldstandards.asp>) offers additional resources to support administrators and teachers in designing, implementing, and enhancing integrated and designated ELD instruction for EL students.

Figure 9 illustrates one approach LEAs can consider when specifically evaluating the extent to which each set of instructional materials under review address integrated ELD. The sample below includes only three prompts and is only an introduction to this tool and this topic. The version of this tool included in the appendix contains 21 example questions, provided for illustration purposes only. LEAs and instructional materials review panels can remove, modify, or add additional questions to better reflect local priorities.

Individuals facilitating this process can ask all members of the review panel to rate each instructional program before meeting to discuss their results. Members of the review panel or LEA leadership can determine what rating is acceptable at the local level. Is a minimum average rating of 3 sufficient, or is a minimum average rating of 4 the goal? The suggested ratings follow:

* A rating of 1 means you did not identify any integrated ELD support at all and would not recommend the instructional program for consideration.
* A rating of 2 means you identified some, though insufficient integrated ELD support, yet you would not consider the instructional program for adoption.
* A rating of 3 means you identified adequate integrated ELD support, and you might consider the instructional program for adoption.
* A rating of 4 means you identified good integrated ELD support, and you would recommend the instructional program for adoption.
* A rating of 5 means you identified consistently strong integrated ELD support, and you would definitely recommend the instructional program for adoption.

In the comments section, members of the review panel can note what is missing, what might need to be augmented, or what can be adapted in order to meet the needs of EL students. If additional contact with publishers is scheduled, reviewers can also include questions for publisher representatives. Naturally, reviewers can also write down notes for themselves or comments they want to share with fellow review panel members.

#### Figure 10: Rating How Instructional Programs Address Integrated English Language Development

| Indicators of Integrated ELD | Rating | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials address language development by  * clearly articulating language objectives; * identifying the linguistic demands of the content; * supporting differentiation of the curriculum; * offering learning activities by English proficiency level; and * referencing and aligning to the *ELD Standards*? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Note what is missing, what might need to be augmented, or what can be adapted in order to meet the needs of EL students.] |
| 1. To what extent are collaborative activities included (involving speaking and writing) that suggest scaffolding for participation based on the ELD standards? | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent are grouping strategies included that call for ELs to collaborate with English-only peers? | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

To develop a more comprehensive set of goals for EL students, access the following resources:

* English Learner Roadmap Principles Overview web page (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/principles.asp>).
* 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/el/er/documents/globalca2030.pdf>).
* *Integrating the CA ELD Standards into K–12 Mathematics and Science Teaching and Learning: A Supplementary Resource* (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/fnl1516agmnteldstndab899.doc>) supports the implementation of the California *ELD Standards* in mathematics and science subject content area instruction.
* *Criteria for Review of Instructional Materials’ Success in Addressing Multilingual Learner (MLL) Linguistic and Instructional Needs* (<https://calcurriculum.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/MLL-Materials-Math-Rubric.pdf>) by California Curriculum Collaborative, in partnership with EdReports, EdSolutions, the English Learners Success Forum, and Pivot Learning (now UnboundEd).
* The Guidelines for Improving Materials for Multilingual Learners (<https://www.elsuccessforum.org/guidelines>) were designed for instructional materials developers and educators to assess the quality of instructional materials by the English Learner Success Forum. Guidelines are available for
  + Science and Engineering Materials (<https://www.elsuccessforum.org/science-guidelines>)
  + Math Materials (<https://www.elsuccessforum.org/math-guidelines>)
  + English Language Arts Materials (<https://www.elsuccessforum.org/ela-guidelines>)

### 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. Evaluations of materials should focus on what evidence shows about how best to teach the standards. The publisher and content developers of instructional materials provide the content to address standards, but they should remain aware of the context of the instruction that will occur using these materials as resources for teachers and students. Bridging the understanding between content and context, and developing instructional resources that provide guidance to teachers while allowing the flexibility necessary for supporting all students is critical.

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 each standard is adequately addressed, which may include addressing individual standards or groupings of related standards, and indicate that in the 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, figure 5 shows a sample Standards Map Template that can be adapted to reflect the particular features of different content standards. Figures 11 and 12 show a Standards Map Template specifically adapted for the 2012 *California Common Core State Standards: Mathematics* (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/documents/ccssmathstandardaug2013.pdf>) and aligned to the guidance in the *Mathematics Framework* (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ma/cf/>). This example is meant to help LEAs understand how a standards or criteria map can be adapted to the particular needs of any content area.

#### Figure 11: Standards Map Template Adapted for Mathematics for Conceptual Ideas or Big Ideas

The first part of the template addresses the Major Conceptual Ideas/Big Ideas as developed in the *Mathematics Framework*. LEAs may use this format to map standards based on major conceptual ideas, or Big Ideas, in any subject area.

| **Major Conceptual Ideas/Big Ideas** | **How do the Program’s Major Conceptual Ideas Map to the Framework’s Big Ideas?** | **How are the Standards Covered Under the Major Conceptual Ideas?** | **Met** | **Not Met** | **Reviewer Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include Conceptual Idea/Big Idea.] | [Include the language of corresponding Major Conceptual Idea/Big Idea.] | [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.] |

#### Figure 12: Standards Map Template Adapted for Mathematics: Standards for Mathematical Practice

The second part of the template addresses Standards for Mathematical Practice (MP).

| Standard | Standard Language | Publisher/ Developer Citations | Met | Not Met | Reviewer Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MP.1 | Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them. | [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.] |
| MP.2 | Reason abstractly and quantitatively. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| MP.3 | Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| MP.4 | Model with mathematics. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| MP.5 | Use appropriate tools strategically. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| MP.6 | Attend to precision. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| MP.7 | Look for and make use of structure. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| MP.8 | Look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |

#### Figure 13: Standards Map Template Adapted for Mathematics: Grade-level Content Standards

The third part of the template addresses discrete standards. The provided example shows one of the grade four grade-level content standards.

| Standard | Cluster/ Standard Language | Publisher/ Developer Citations | Met | Not Met | Reviewer Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Blank] | Use the four operations with whole numbers to solve problems. | How does the program address this aspect of the domain? (Enter text here) | [Check if met.] | [Check if not met.] | [Reviewers use this portion to capture their own comments, citations, or questions.] |
| 4.OA.1 | Interpret a multiplication equation as a comparison, e.g., interpret 35 = 5 × 7 as a statement that 35 is 5 times as many as 7 and 7 times as many as 5. Represent verbal statements of multiplicative comparisons as multiplication equations. | [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 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 LEAs 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 evaluation criteria for each content area will likely vary slightly to better reflect the particular priorities or goals discussed in their respective curriculum framework. For example, the evaluation criteria maps for mathematics would call attention to mathematical practices, rich tasks, inquiry, use of data and real-world problems, and other features discussed in the instructional materials chapter of the *Mathematics Framework*.

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.

#### Figure 14: 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>). 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. LEAs 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 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. A pilot committee is typically comprised of the LEA leaders and teachers participating in the field test and the ultimate selection of instructional materials.

### 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 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 LEA 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 LEA and school. 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 teachers to pilot each of the competing programs offers a more complete discussion of the benefits and potential gaps of the programs.
   2. It is recommended that pilot committees examine the scope and sequence of each program to 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. This step can ensure that teachers are comparing similar components of competing programs (e.g., intervention materials, EL support, or 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 instructional materials 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.
* LEA leadership should be mindful of communication during the recruitment process in order to ensure transparency and the recruitment of a wide range of participants. 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 EL students at various levels of English development, students with disabilities, and any other district priorities that will inform the final decision and will be reflective of district goals. Consider teachers with a range of experience and expertise within the subject matter, English language development, and special education.
* 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

LEA leadership and all participants involved in piloting instructional materials can work together 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. The rating scales included in the figure are examples. Some questions may be better suited for short-answer responses.

#### Figure 15: 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.] |
| Did the lesson align to the content standard addressed? | [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.] |
| Did the lesson provide adequate guidance for English learners at various proficiency levels? | [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. Student responses in this figure are examples and can be adapted to suit LEA needs. Consideration should be given to the developmental level of the students to ensure that all grade levels and students with a range of abilities can participate in evaluating the instructional materials.

#### Figure 16: 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

LEAs should fully train all participants in the pilot process as well as in the use of the instructional program materials being piloted. LEAs may consider asking the publishers or content developers to provide an overview and initial training of all components of the program, including providing 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. The process of working toward consensus should be included in the training process.

### 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 or content developers to assist in making final decisions. They may also request that publishers or content developers provide additional training to teachers during the pilot process as needed.

#### 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
* EL 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.

#### Figure 17: 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. For more information regarding reaching consensus, access “Making Your Decision” at [https://cdn.edreports.org/media/2021/09/Making\_Your\_Decision.pdf?\_gl=1\*7tm9hm\*\_gcl\_au\*MTA0OTk4MzkzOS4xNjk1MDUzMjk1](https://cdn.edreports.org/media/2021/09/Making_Your_Decision.pdf?_gl=1*7tm9hm*_gcl_au*MTA0OTk4MzkzOS4xNjk1MDUzMjk1).

#### Alternative Review Options

Although a full pilot process may be the most comprehensive, there are alternative review options. Two are described 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 the following:

* *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>)
* Government Code Section 54950 [<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?division=2.&chapter=9.&part=1.&lawCode=GOV&title=5>
* AB 1078 (<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240AB1078>)



## Initial 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. It can take many months or years to fully implement new instructional materials. The recommendations in the following section can be considered an initial implementation. LEAs should continue to monitor progress and the needs of their students and teachers throughout the first years of adopting new instructional materials.

### Publisher and Content Developer Considerations

Communication with the selected publisher 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, 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 or content developers allows for instructional materials training in districtwide or schoolwide 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 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 districtwide 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 and identify potential learning gaps. LEAs should consider monitoring feedback from instructional leaders, teachers, students, parents, and community members to assess the program’s effectiveness in meeting LEA goals and to develop professional learning opportunities.



## Resources

### Access California Department of Education Resources for Additional Information and Guidance.

* *California Common Core State Standards: Mathematics* (published in 2013): <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/documents/ccssmathstandardaug2013.pdf>
* 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>
* California Dyslexia Guidelines: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/documents/cadyslexiaguidelines.pdf>
* *California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities:* <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/documents/ab2785guide.pdf>
* California Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content*,* 2013 Edition: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/socialcontent2013.doc>
* 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 Language Development Standards:<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/eldstandards.asp>
* English Learner Roadmap Principles Overview: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/principles.asp>
* English Learners with Disabilities: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/elpracguideswd.asp>
* General Requirements for EL Student Programs: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/co/ca21assuranceelprogram.asp>
* *Global California 2030 Speak. Learn. Lead.*: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/globalca2030.pdf>
* Implementation of Instructional Materials Not Adopted by California: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/im/implementofimsnotadopt.asp>
* Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/lr/ideareathztn.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/>
* Literacy Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations web page (<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/literacy-and-reading-instruction>)
* Materials for Social Content: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/socialcontent2013.doc>
* *Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* (published in 2023): <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ma/cf/>
* 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>
* SBE Instructional Materials Evaluation and Adoption Process: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/cefimadoptprocess.asp>
* Social Content Standards: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/abridgedsocialcontent.asp>
* Special Education – CalEdFacts (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/cefspeced.asp>)
* Universal Prekindergarten Frequently Asked Questions: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/em/kinderfaq.asp>

### California *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* Section 60002. Regarding substantial teacher involvement in the selection of instructional materials: ([*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)),
* *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 60047. Regarding instructional resources not in compliance with the Social Content Standards being required to be revised or withdrawn: <https://law.justia.com/citations.html>
* *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.

* AB 1078, which emphasizes a pupil's right to share ideas and beliefs and to receive information and knowledge, under the California Constitution: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240AB1078>
* California County Superintendents: <https://ccsesa.org/committees/cisc/cisc-public-resources/>
* California Dyslexia Initiative: <https://www.scoe.net/divisions/ed_services/curriculum/cadyslexia/>
* 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>
* *Criteria for Review of Instructional Materials’ Success in Addressing Multilingual Learner (MLL) Linguistic and Instructional Needs*: <https://calcurriculum.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/MLL-Materials-Math-Rubric.pdf>
* EdReports: <https://www.edreports.org/>
* EdReports, “Making Your Decision”: [https://cdn.edreports.org/media/2021/09/Making\_Your\_Decision.pdf?\_gl=1\*7tm9hm\*\_gcl\_au\*MTA0OTk4MzkzOS4xNjk1MDUzMjk1](https://cdn.edreports.org/media/2021/09/Making_Your_Decision.pdf?_gl=1*7tm9hm*_gcl_au*MTA0OTk4MzkzOS4xNjk1MDUzMjk1)
* 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>
* Guidelines for Improving Materials for Multilingual Learners: <https://www.elsuccessforum.org/guidelines>
  + Science and Engineering Materials (<https://www.elsuccessforum.org/science-guidelines>)
  + Math Materials (<https://www.elsuccessforum.org/math-guidelines>)
  + English Language Arts Materials (<https://www.elsuccessforum.org/ela-guidelines>)
* History–Social Science Adoption Toolkit: <https://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/HSS-Toolkit-FINAL.pdf>
* Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Section 300.114 LRE requirements (<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/regs/b/b/300.114>)
* *Integrating the CA ELD Standards into K–12 Mathematics and Science Teaching and Learning: A Supplementary Resource*: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/fnl1516agmnteldstndab899.doc>
* 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>
* Universal Design for Learning Guidelines (<https://udlguidelines.cast.org/>)



## 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.] |

### Standards Map Template Adapted for Mathematics for Conceptual Ideas or Big Ideas

This template can be used to map standards based on major conceptual ideas in any subject area.

| **Major Conceptual Ideas/Big Ideas** | **How do the program’s Major Conceptual Ideas map to the Framework’s Big Ideas?** | **How are the Standards Covered under the Major Conceptual Ideas?** | **Met** | **Not Met** | **Reviewer Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include Conceptual Idea/Big Idea.] | [Include the language of corresponding Major Conceptual Idea/Big Idea.] | [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.] |

### Standards Map Template Adapted for Mathematics: Standards for Mathematical Practice

This the template addresses standards for mathematical practice.

| Standard | Standard Language | Publisher/Developer Citations | Met Yes | Met No | Reviewer Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [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.] |

### Standards Map Template Adapted for Mathematics: Grade-level Content Standards

This template addresses discrete grade-level content standards.

| Standard | Cluster/ Standard Language | Publisher/ Developer Citations | Met | Not Met | Reviewer Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [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.] |

### 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.] |

### Rating How Instructional Programs Support Student Groups

| Student Group | Priorities | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Include student populations whose academic and other needs may require special consideration. This may include English learners, newcomer students, students with special needs, and advanced students.] | [Briefly articulate key priorities for student groups.] | [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.] |

### Rating How Instructional Programs Support Students with Disabilities

| Priorities | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Instructional materials integrate the principles of UDL, including options for Engagement, Representation, and Action and Expression. | [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.] |
| Instructional materials align with research consensus of effective instruction for SWDs. | [Continue from above.] | [Continue from above.] |
| Instructional materials include teacher suggestions, ancillary materials, or other support for providing accommodations and/or modifications to the general curriculum for SWDs. | [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 English Learners

| Priorities | Rate Program A | Rate Program B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Briefly articulate key priorities for EL students.] | [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.] |

### Rating How Instructional Programs Address Integrated English Language Development

| Indicators of Integrated ELD | Rating | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials address language development by  * clearly articulating language objectives; * identifying the linguistic demands of the content; * supporting differentiation of the curriculum; * offering learning activities by English proficiency level; and * referencing and aligning to the *ELD Standards*? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Note what is missing, what might need to be augmented, or what can be adapted in order to meet the needs of EL students.] |
| 1. To what extent are collaborative activities included (involving speaking and writing) that suggest scaffolding for participation based on the ELD standards? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent are grouping strategies included that call for English learners to collaborate with English-only peers? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do the activities, prompts and materials draw and build on EL students’ (and their families’) knowledge, cultural, and linguistic assets? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials suggest strategies for creating a classroom environment that is language-rich, print-rich, and content-rich? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials suggest strategies for curriculum integration, motivating and engaging all learners, or navigating intellectual challenges? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent are the instructional materials high quality, respectful of diversity, and culturally inclusive? This includes the use of precise academic language, up-to-date content, and quality visuals—charts, graphic organizers and other graphic elements to bolster comprehension. | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials strategically suggest regular, scaffolded opportunities for EL students to develop academic discourse skills? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials focus on the teaching of—as well as the provision of practice with—grade- and age-appropriate, increasingly sophisticated, academic vocabulary? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials identify language that may be challenging for English learners? Some examples include polysemous words (words that have more than one possible meaning, such as “bat” or “play”), culturally- or context-specific words or phrases, idioms, or potentially complex syntax. | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials provide opportunities for EL students to develop both content knowledge and academic English? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent are the instructional materials designed to provide daily opportunities for English learners to engage in reading and writing using differentiated scaffolds? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent are teachers provided guidance and resources for supporting cross-language connections and transfer—including informational resources for teachers comparing language features of other languages to English? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials provide for differentiated tasks, scaffolding, and support for English learners at a range of proficiency levels? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials provide materials and guidance for differentiated tasks, scaffolding and support for    * long-term English learners;    * newcomers; and    * students with limited or interrupted formal education? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do the instructional materials offer suggestions for flexible, differentiated instruction based on formative assessment? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent are curriculum-embedded formative assessments normed and linguistically appropriate for English language learners? Evidence may include clear guidance regarding the use of those assessments to inform the ongoing, dynamic differentiation of learning tasks, instructional approaches, and supports for EL students. | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent does the suggested pacing allow    * for EL students to build knowledge and be deeply engaged in a topic; and    * for the teacher to provide flexibility to scaffold to support and promote EL students’ learning? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent are the selection of texts and adaptations of text appropriate for English learners? Evidence may include reading material and language supports (such as glossaries and visuals) designed to help engage students in intellectually rich content, as well as activities that call for EL students to read, hear, speak, and write complex text? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do instructional materials and learning activities    * leverage the home language through supplementary texts in major languages;    * support cross-language connections and cross-linguistic transfer; and    * incorporate informational resources for teachers comparing language features of other languages to English? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [Continue from above.] |
| 1. To what extent do instructional materials include resources to enable teachers and students to access primary language support in languages other than English? | [Rate from 1 to 5.] | [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.] |

### Text Accessible Descriptions of Graphics

#### Figure 4: Instructional Materials Selection Decision Tree

The graphic titled Instructional Materials Selection Decision Tree shows a flowchart that guides individuals in determining what the decision points are and what likely next steps are available to LEAs selecting instructional materials.

The starting point is a decision point that reads, “Establish evaluation committee involving teachers at all grade levels, relevant program leaders, administrators, and parents.” An arrow points to the next decision point, which reads, “Has the district LCAP been reviewed for actions related to the adoption of materials in the content area? Does the LCAP adoption information appear in one or more years?”

From this second decision point, two arrows point to two possible answers. If the answer is no, an arrow points to a box that reads, “Review LCAP.” A second arrow points to a box that reads, “Yes.” From the “yes” box, another arrow points to the third decision point: “Have student strengths and weaknesses been identified using district and/or site-level data?”

Once again, two arrows point to two possible answers. If the answer is no, an arrow points to a box that reads, “Analyze data.” A second arrow points to a box that reads, “Yes.” From the “yes” box, another arrow points to the fourth decision point: “Do the materials on the current SBE adoption list support the needs of all students?”

Two arrows point to two possible answers. At this juncture, however, the paths for a no or yes answer lead to different paths.

If the answer to this question is yes, the next step is straightforward. There is an arrow that points to the final step in the flowchart: “Proceed with selection and implementation per local process.”

If the answer is no, an arrow points to a box that reads, “Has the plan to purchase and pilot materials not on the SBE adoption list been approved by the local board?” Two arrows point to two possible answers. If the answer is no, an arrow points to a box that reads, “Acquire approval.” A second arrow points to a box that reads, “Yes.” From the “yes” box, another arrow points to the next decision point: “Review curriculum framework in subject area for guidance in evaluating non-adopted materials.” From this point on, the next steps in the sequence progress in a linear manner.

1. “Develop evaluation instrument based on current content standards, criteria and guidance in framework, Achieve Toolkit, the CCSESA Adoption Toolkit. Evaluation includes a review for compliance with the 2013 Social Content Standards.”
2. “Evaluate materials for alignment with current standards and framework in a process that is thoroughly planned, conducted publicly, and well documented.”
3. “Review selected materials for accessibility and compliance with Williams.”
4. This all leads to the final step: “Proceed with selection and implementation per local process.”

[Return to Figure 4](#_Figure_4:_Instructional)
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