MIAMI-DADE COMMITTEE EVALUATION FORM
Guidelines for the Review of Mathematics Instructional Materials
K-12 Mathematics

Subject Area Committee_____

Course for which recommended_____

Publisher_____

Title of Submission_____

Directions: Use this form to independently review each submission. As part of your independent review, rate and comment on how well the submission satisfies the requirements. Ratings are as follows:
4 – THOROUGHLY (completely superior)
3 – HIGHLY (partially superior)
2 – ADEQUATELY (satisfactory)
1 – MINIMALLY (barely adequately)
0 – NOT AT ALL (inadequate)

ALIGNMENT TO FLORIDA'S PERSPECTIVE	Yes	No	Comments (e.g., specific examples, strengths, concerns, questions)
Alignment to Florida's Perspective - Does the submission align to the following sections of the specifications?			
1. Florida's Continuous Improvement Model: Does this submission include correlations and/or focus lessons to the math and reading assessed benchmarks?			
2. Reading in the Content Area: Does this submission support reading in the content area?			
3. Universal Design for Curriculum Access: Does this submission incorporate strategies, materials, activities, etc. that consider the special needs of all students?			
4. Florida's Vision for the Subject Area and General Description for Publishers' Submission: Has the publisher "answered the call" that was described in the vision and general description of this section of the specifications? If not, and it is your opinion that this submission should not be recommended for adoption as a result of this, please list your concerns here.			

CONTENT	4 - THOROUGHLY	3 - HIGHLY	2 - ADEQUATELY	1 - MINIMALLY	0 – NOT AT ALL	Comments (e.g., specific examples, strengths, concerns, questions)
A. Alignment with curriculum- Is the mathematics aligned with the learning expectation presented in Principles and Standards for School Mathematics, the District Curriculum, and the Florida Next Generation Sunshine State Standards?						
• How well were the correlations done?						
• Is the content thoroughly covered in the major tool?						
A2. Alignment with curriculum – How well does the submission align with the PROCESS STANDARDS for mathematics?						
• Problem solving – How well does the submission incorporate problem solving?						
• Representations – How well does the submission incorporate representations?						
• Reasoning and Proof – How well does the submission incorporate reasoning and proof?						
• Connections - How well does the submission incorporate connections?						
• Communications - How well does the submission incorporate communications?						
B. Level of Treatment (Development of Mathematical Ideas) -How well does the level (complexity or difficulty) of the treatment of content match the standard, student abilities and grade level, and time periods allowed for teaching?						
• Are mathematical ideas connected and interwoven across strands instead of studied in isolation?						
• Is there an appropriate balance of skill development, conceptual understanding and mathematics processes?						
• Are mathematics topics represented in depth and with increasing sophistication across grades?						
• Do contextual problems engage students and give rise to mathematic ideas?						

• How developmentally appropriate for the age and maturity level of the intended students is the content?						
C. Expertise for Content Development - How expert are the authors, reviewers, and sources that contributed to the development of the materials?						
• Do the credentials of authors reflect expertise in the subject area?						
• Do the primary and secondary sources reflect expert information for the subject, such as relevant data from research journals and other recognized scientific sources?						
D. Accuracy of Content -How accurately is the content presented?						
• Does the content remain factual and objective? Is it free of mistakes, errors, inconsistencies, contradictions within itself, and biases of interpretation? Do visuals or other elements contribute to the accuracy of text or narrative?						

	4 - THOROUGHLY	3 - HIGHLY	2 - ADEQUATELY	1 - MINIMALLY	0 – NOT AT ALL	
• Does the content correctly represent the domain of knowledge and events? Does the content include the generally accepted and prevalent theories, major concepts, laws, standards, and models used within the discipline of the subject area?						
• Is the presentation of content free of typographical and visual errors?						
E. Currency of Content - Is the content up-to-date for the academic discipline and the context in which the content is presented?						

• Are the copyright dates for photographs and other materials and editions current? Does this edition reflect more up-to-date information than earlier editions?	
• Do the text or narrative, visuals, photographs, and other features reflect the time period appropriate for the objectives and intended learners?	
F. Authenticity of Content - Does the content include problem-centered connections to life in a context that is meaningful to students?	
• Does the content make connections to the student's life situations in order to make it more meaningful?	
• Are there interdisciplinary connections made within the content?	
• Do the materials provide a rich source of problems, exercised, and projects that can be used for homework?	
G. Multicultural Representation - If gender, ethnicity, age, work situations, and various social groups have been portrayed, has the portrayal been fair and unbiased?	
• Is there a balanced representation of cultures and groups in multiple settings, occupations, careers, and lifestyles? Is there an integration of social diversity throughout the instructional materials?	

	4 - THOROUGHLY	3 - HIGHLY	2 - ADEQUATELY	1 - MINIMALLY	0 – NOT AT ALL	
H. Humanity and Compassion - In the portrayal of people and animals, is there compassion, sympathy, and consideration of their needs and values? Has pornography and inhumane treatment of people and animals been avoided?						
• When providing examples in narrative or visuals, do the materials depict the care and treatment of people and animals with compassion, sympathy, and consideration?						

• In the context of personal and family values, has pornography and inhumane treatment of people and animals been avoided?						
SUMMARY ANALYSIS FOR CONTENT - In general, how well does the submission satisfy CONTENT requirements?						
PRESENTATION						**Comments (e.g., specific examples, strengths, concerns, questions)**
A. Comprehensiveness of Student and Teacher Resources - Are resources complete enough to address the targeted learning outcomes without requiring the teacher to prepare additional teaching materials for the course?						
• Are the student resources complete enough, labeled correctly, and have directions that are easily followed?						
• Are the components and materials available for the teacher easy to use, including licenses or agreements for copying and use of materials, description of required equipment, facilities, resources?						

	4 - THOROUGHLY	3 - HIGHLY	2 - ADEQUATELY	1 - MINIMALLY	0 – NOT AT ALL	
• Do the ancillary materials support lesson planning, teaching, and learning? (background for lectures and discussions, technical terminology, reinforcement and review strategies, suggestions for individualized study, small-group and large-group presentations, scope and sequence chart for activities and planning)						
• Do the materials provide opportunities for teachers to increase their own understanding of the mathematics						

ideas that students are studying?	
• Are there suggestions and approaches to adapting instruction for varying needs?	
• Are there guidelines and resources for alternate assessments, answer guides, sample project guides, rubrics, portfolios?	
• Are there materials for displays or photocopies, classroom management strategies, in-service workshops available?	
B. Alignment of Instructional Components - How well do all the components of the instructional package align with each other, as well as with the curriculum?	
• Are all the materials provided by the publisher integrated and interdependent with each other? Do they correspond with each other?	
C. Organization of Instructional Materials - Do the structure and format of the materials have enough order and clarity to allow students and teachers to access content and explicitly identify ideas and sequences?	
• Is there explicit and teachable structure to the materials?	
• Are there features to help in searching and locating information? (table of contents, index, goals/objectives, outlines, checklists, etc.)	

	4 - THOROUGHLY	3 - HIGHLY	2 - ADEQUATELY	1 - MINIMALLY	0 – NOT AT ALL
• Are there visible formats and structure? (chapter/unit titles; use of bold, italics, changes in size of type; border divisions, boxes, circles, highlighting, icons; diagrams, labels, visuals near related content, numbering of pages; introductions, summaries)					
• Is the pattern of organization of the content consistent and logical for the type of subject or topic?					
D. Readability of Instructional Materials - Are the narratives and visuals appropriate to the students' abilities?					
• Is the text organized and coherent? Are the language and concepts used familiar to students? Does the language clarify, simplify, and explain? Are logical connections made? Is the language concrete? Is the sentence structure varied? Is the active voice used? Are there specific questions or directions to guide student attention to key information?					
• Do the materials provide useful diagrams, charts, data sets, and/or models to help students conceptualize mathematics ideas?					
• Are the visual features clear, with good contrast? Does the paper have clean-cut edges without glare? Are the margins wide enough? Has the text been chunked? Are the visuals relevant, clear, vivid, and simple enough? Is there a suitable number of visuals and are they appropriate for the intended audience? Are graphs, charts, maps, and other visual representations integrated at the point of use? Are the colors, size of print, spacing, quantity, and type of visuals suitable for the abilities and needs of intended students?					
E. Pacing of Content - Is the amount of content presented at one time or the pace at which it is presented of a size or rate that allows students to perceive and understand it?					

	4 - THOROUGHLY	3 - HIGHLY	2 - ADEQUATELY	1 - MINIMALLY	0 – NOT AT ALL	
F. Ease of Use and Durability of Materials - Are both the print and other media formats of the materials easy to use and replace, and will they be durable enough for multiple uses over time?						
• Do the actual physical and technical qualities of materials match the description contained in the publisher's warranty? Will the materials hold up during a six-year adoption period?						
• Are the materials designed for practical use in the classroom and school environments? Are they easy to identify and store?						
• Do the technology-rich resources work properly without the purchase of additional software and do they run without error?						
SUMMARY ANALYSIS FOR PRESENTATION - In general, how well does the submission satisfy PRESENTATION requirements?						
LEARNING						**Comments (e.g., specific examples, strengths, concerns, questions)**
A. Motivational Strategies - How well do the materials maintain learner motivation?						
• Do the materials positively influence the expectations of students? Are there activities, tasks, or approaches to stimulate intellectual curiosity? Are there tasks related to student interests, and activities relevant to the student's life? Are the materials challenging and thought-provoking?						

	4 - THOROUGHLY	3 - HIGHLY	2 - ADEQUATELY	1 - MINIMALLY	0 – NOT AT ALL	
• Do the activities foster the development of mathematics as a human endeavor and a way of thinking?						
• Are worthwhile mathematical tasks offered to engage, motivate, and challenge all students to think mathematically?						
• Do the materials provide informative and positive feedback on progress? Are there frequent checks, examples of correct responses, and varied forms of assessments? Overall, do the materials have a pleasing appearance?						
B. Teaching a Few "Big Ideas" – How well do these materials teach a few important ideas, concepts, or themes?						
• Is there a focus on teaching a few big ideas?						
• Is there a focus on developing a deeper and more complete understanding of the major themes of the content or subject area?						
C. Explicit Instruction – How well do the materials contain clear statements of information and outcomes?						
• Is there a clear statement and explanation of purpose, goals, and expected outcomes? Are directions clear? Are concepts, rules, information, and terms clear? Do activities and lessons provide explicit directions?						
• Is information provided regarding what students might already know about mathematics ideas, including common misconceptions, which instruction should address?						
• Have terms and phrases with ambiguous meanings, confusing directions or descriptions, and inadequate explanations been avoided?						
D. Guidance and Support - How well do the materials provide guidance and support to help students safely and successfully become more independent learners and						

thinkers?						
• Has scaffolding been used successfully? Are there organized routines, advance organizers, prompts, step-by-step instructions, immediate and corrective feedback, simulations, opportunities for research provided in the materials?						
• Do materials maintain high expectations for all students?						

	4 - THOROUGHLY	3 - HIGHLY	2 - ADEQUATELY	1 - MINIMALLY	0 – NOT AT ALL	
• Are the guidance and support adaptable to developmental differences and various learning styles? Have a variety of activities, as well as a variety of modalities been included?						
E. Active Participation of Students - How well do the materials engage the physical and mental activity of students during the learning process?						
• Do lessons promote classroom investigation and exploration?						
• Do lessons promote classroom discourse by explicitly requiring students to share their thinking or strategies?						
• Do the materials include organized activities of periodic, frequent, and short assignments that are logical extensions of content, goals, and objectives?						
• Are students given the opportunity to respond orally or in writing? Do they have the opportunity to create visual representations, generate products, or think of new situations for applying or extending what they learn? Can they generate their own questions? Are they given choices of activities, allowed to complete discovery activities, or form their own analogies?						
F. Targeted Instructional Strategies – How well do						

the materials take into consideration that different learning outcomes require different instructional strategies?						
• Do the instructional materials match what current research shows about targeting instructional strategies for different learning outcomes?						
• Do lessons involve the use of instructional technology, manipulative, or other tools so that students can visualize complex concepts, acquire and analyze information, and communicate solutions?						
• Do activities promote student inquiry, reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and sense making?						
• Are there provisions for adapting instructional activities to accommodate special-needs students?						
• Are the strategies complete enough to effectively teach the targeted outcomes?						
G. Targeted Assessment Strategies - How well do the materials correlate assessment strategies to the desired learning outcomes?						

	4 - THOROUGHLY	3 - HIGHLY	2 - ADEQUATELY	1 - MINIMALLY	0 – NOT AT ALL	
• Do the assessment strategies match the learner performance requirements for the types of learning outcomes that have been targeted for the subject matter? Do the instructional materials take into consideration that different strategies are appropriate for assessing different types of learning outcomes?						
• Are assessment tools such as tasks, open-ended questions, and tests provided for assessing student learning and informing instructional decision making?						
• Are the strategies complete enough to effectively assess the learner's performance with regard to the targeted outcome?						
SUMMARY ANALYSIS FOR LEARNING - In general, how well						

does the submission satisfy LEARNING requirements?						

OVERALL EVALUATION			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments (e.g., specific examples, strengths, concerns,**
1. If given the responsibility for teaching the course for which these materials were developed, do you feel confident that these materials could be used as the major tool?			
2. Does the publisher's description of the submission as recorded in the Publisher's Questionnaire correspond with the actual components submitted and reviewed?			
3. Do all the components (major tool and ancillaries) directly support the same purpose and goals?			
4. Is there enough material presented to teach this course for the length of time required? In other words, if this is a year-long course, is there enough material (lessons, activities, etc.) for a year-long course?			
5. What notations (if any) do you think should be included in the Catalog? (e.g., these materials would also be appropriate for…; these materials are especially suited for…)			
6. Mathematics content emphasis: Does the textbook include mathematics concepts that are developmentally appropriate, challenging, and accessible for **all** students?			
7. Instructional Focus: Are students ***doing*** mathematics? That is, is there significant "mathematical activity" required for **all** students?			
8. Teacher Support: Do support materials enhance the quality of mathematics instruction?			