MDCPS COMMITTEE EVALUATION FORM

Guidelines for the Review of Science Instructional Materials

| | Thoroughly (completely superior) |
|------------------------------|---|
| Subject Area Committee | Highly (partially superior) Adequately (satisfactory) Minimally (barely adequately) |
| Course for Which Recommended | Not at all (inadequate) Submissions rated adequately overall are not expected to be recommended for adoption. This form will be collected upon adjournment |
| Publisher | of the State Instructional Materials Committee meeting and is subject to disclosure per Florida Sunshine laws. Comments and evaluations on this |
| Title of Submission | form represent the individual's ratings/comments prior to the meeting and do not necessarily reflect the individual's final evaluation. |

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:

| CONTENT | RATING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|----------|
| A1. Alignment with curriculum How well does the content align with the NEXT GENERATION SUNSHINE STATE STANDARDS for the subject, grade level, and learning outcomes? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| A2. Alignment with curriculum General Description For Publishers Submissions How well is the requirement not to use science concepts or vocabulary at a grade level earlier than that designated in the standards met? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| A3. Alignment with curriculum General Description For Publishers Submissions How well does the submission integrate the Nature of Science benchmarks throughout the entire curriculum? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| A4. Alignment with curriculum General Description For Publishers Submissions How well does the submission incorporate the language arts, mathematics, and health benchmarks included in the course description? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |

| CONTENT | RATING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|----------|
| B. Level of Treatment How well does the level (complexity or difficulty) of the treatment of content match the standards, student abilities and grade level, and time periods allowed for teaching? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| C. Expertise for Content Development | Thoroughly Highly | |
| How expert are the authors, reviewers, and sources that contributed to the development of the materials? | Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| D. Accuracy of Content How accurately is the content presented? | Thoroughly Highly | |
| | Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| E. Currency of Content | Thoroughly | |
| Is the content up-to-date for the academic discipline and the context in which the content is presented? | ☐ Highly ☐ Adequately ☐ Minimally ☐ Not at All | |
| F. Authenticity of Content Does the content include problem-centered connections | Thoroughly Highly | |
| to life in a context that is meaningful to students? | Adequately Minimally | |
| G. Multicultural Representation | Thoroughly Highly | |
| If gender, ethnicity, age, work situations, and various social groups have been portrayed, has the portrayal been fair and unbiased? | Adequately Minimally | |
| 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? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |

| CONTENT | RATING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|----------|
| I. Discipline-Specific Literacy Florida Perspective How well does this submission support discipline- specific literacy? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| SUMMARY ANALYSIS FOR CONTENT In general, how well does the submission satisfy CONTENT requirements? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| PRESENTATION | RATING | COMMENTS |
| 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? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| 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? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| 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? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| D. Readability of Instructional Materials Are the narratives and visuals appropriate to the students' abilities? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |

| PRESENTATION | RATING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|----------|
| 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? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally 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? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| SUMMARY ANALYSIS FOR PRESENTATION In general, how well does the submission satisfy PRESENTATION requirements? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| | | |
| LEARNING | RATING | COMMENTS |
| LEARNING A. Motivational Strategies How well do the materials maintain learner motivation? | RATING Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | COMMENTS |
| A. Motivational Strategies | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally | |

| LEARNING | RATING | COMMENTS |
|---|---|----------|
| C. Explicit Instruction How well do the materials contain clear statements of information and outcomes? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| 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? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| E. Active Participation of Students How well do the materials engage the physical and mental activity of students during the learning process? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| F. Targeted Instructional Strategies How well do the materials take into consideration that different learning outcomes require different instructional strategies? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| G. Targeted Assessment Strategies How well do the materials correlate assessment strategies to the desired learning outcomes? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| H. Critical Components of K-12 Science Teaching & Learning Florida's Vision for Science Education How well does the submission cover the critical components of K-12 science teaching and learning? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |

| LEARNING | RATING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|----------|
| I. Universal Design for Curriculum Access Florida's Perspective How well does this submission incorporate stratgies, materials, activities, etc., that consider the needs of all students? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |
| SUMMARY ANALYSIS FOR LEARNING In general, how well does the submission satisfy LEARNING requirements? | Thoroughly Highly Adequately Minimally Not at All | |

| OVERALL EVALUATION | RATING | COMMENTS |
|---|---------------|----------|
| Does the major tool provide instructional content and student learning activities for -each of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) benchmarks that are in the Florida course descriptions? OR -the course objectives as outlined by the College Board for an Advanced Placement (AP) course? | ☐ Yes ☐ No | |
| 2. Does the submission include all benchmarks and benchmark codes at point of use in both the student and teacher major tool? (Leave blank for AP.) | r Yes r No | |
| 3. No more than 10% of the content in the major tool can address concepts outside the realm of the required benchmarks for the grade or course for which it is being submitted. Was this requirement met? (Leave blank for AP) | TYes No | |
| 4. Does the submission meet the time requirement as specified in the course description? | TYes No | |
| 5. Are all the ancillaries submitted designed to work with the major tool? | TYes No | |
| 6. What notation (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) | ☐ Yes ☐ No | |