

# **Texas Resource Review Response to Quality Rubric Feedback**

**ELAR Foundational Literacy (K-2), K-8 Mathematics, and  
Prekindergarten Systems Rubrics**

**February 5, 2020**

## Table of Contents

<a href="#"><u>Summary of Texas Resource Review Rubric Development Process and Response to Feedback</u></a> .....	<b>3</b>
<a href="#"><u>Stakeholder Feedback and TEA Response to All Three Rubrics</u></a> .....	<b>4</b>
<a href="#"><u>ELAR Foundational Literacy (K-2) Rubric: Stakeholder Feedback and TEA Response</u></a> .....	<b>9</b>
<a href="#"><u>K-8 Mathematics Rubric: Stakeholder Feedback and TEA Response</u></a> .....	<b>15</b>
<a href="#"><u>Prekindergarten Systems Rubric: Stakeholder Feedback and TEA Response</u></a> .....	<b>22</b>

## Summary of Texas Resource Review Rubric Development Process and Response to Feedback

This memo provides a sampling of changes made to the ELAR Foundational Literacy (K-2), K-8 Mathematics, and Prekindergarten Systems quality rubrics based on the feedback received from stakeholders. The main changes to all three rubrics included: increased emphasis on embedded progress monitoring and expansion of supports for all learners. In response to feedback, TEA is also working to provide additional clarity around the definitions of key terms and research used in the rubrics. A summary of feedback trends for all rubrics and the action taken by TEA in response to these trends can be found beginning on the next page of this document, and content-specific changes to each rubric are on the following pages.

Written into statute in 2017 (Texas Education Code § 31.081 and § 31.082), TEA will conduct an independent analysis of instructional materials to evaluate their quality. The resulting reviews will provide local education agencies (LEAs) across Texas with free, clear, and user-friendly information about the quality of materials, which LEAs may choose to use as part of their local review processes.

As a part of this process, the agency will ensure the definition of quality is transparently communicated via Texas Resource Review rubrics that will be used to assess all instructional materials. Development of the Prekindergarten Systems, K-8 Mathematics, and ELAR Foundational Literacy (K-2) rubrics occurred in three phases:

- **Phase I: Draft Rubric Creation.** TEA internal teams and content experts planned for creation of each rubric. This included input from individuals at TEA with expertise in a variety of areas, including early childhood education, literacy curriculum, mathematics curriculum, special populations, communications, and school improvement. TEA then hosted a series of 2-day working groups with content experts from across Texas, including individuals from districts, ESCs, and institutions of higher learning. These working group sessions resulted in draft rubrics.
- **Phase II: Outreach and Public Feedback.** TEA posted the draft rubrics for a 30-day public comment period. During this phase, TEA held a working session with SBOE members. TEA shared the rubrics with publishers and conducted webinars and individual calls to gather feedback. TEA also hosted optional virtual feedback sessions for ESC staff, several Texas educational organizations, and interested individuals.
- **Phase III: Final Rubric.** TEA finalized the rubrics after incorporating public comments, SBOE member feedback, virtual working group feedback, and feedback from ESC and publisher webinars and calls. TEA then published the final rubrics on the TEA website. The final rubrics will remain constant to provide transparency during the review process.

## Stakeholder Feedback and TEA Response to All Three Rubrics

### Subset of Notable Agreement with All Three Rubrics Based on Stakeholder Feedback

Several components of the structure, content, and communicated purpose of all three rubrics were supported by various stakeholders through feedback. These supported trends were preserved in the final rubrics:

- Structure and Organization of the Rubric:** Overall, feedback on the structure of the rubrics named that they were user-friendly, clear, well-organized, and easy to follow. Therefore, no large structural overhaul was made to the format of the rubrics as a result of stakeholder feedback.
- Guidance for Teachers:** Many stakeholders named their agreement with the presence of guidance for teachers in the instructional materials as a strength of the rubrics. This shows that stakeholders engaged in feedback on the rubrics believe that strong instructional materials should include both the content that students should learn and strategies to support teachers in internalizing and teaching this content.
- Purpose and Utility of Rubric:** Many stakeholders named that the rubrics will support LEAs in making decisions on instructional materials to adopt.

### Subset of Notable Changes Made to All Three Rubrics Based on Stakeholder Feedback

The table below details notable changes made to the Prekindergarten Systems, K-8 Mathematics, and ELAR Foundational Literacy (K-2) rubrics, based on stakeholder feedback.

Feedback Source(s)	Feedback Trend	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
Content and Field Experts, 2-Day Working Groups	Quality materials should include frequent, embedded opportunities to measure student progress and opportunities for students to track their own learning.	TEA created a new section – Progress Monitoring – which includes three quality indicators on progress monitoring that address: developmentally appropriate nature of tools, presence of guidance on responding to data, and the frequency and embedded nature of progress monitoring. Embedded, frequent, developmentally appropriate progress monitoring aligns to current research on best practices in assessment and instruction.
Content and Field Experts, 2-Day Working Groups	The rubrics should expand the Supports for Diverse Learners. (The	TEA renamed a section in each rubric – from Supports for Diverse Learners to Supports for All Learners. The quality indicator on supports

	initial draft of this section included three indicators that named supports for three different groups of students: students above grade-level, students below grade-level, and English Learners).	for English Learners from the initial draft remains, while the other indicators are expanded to include guidance, scaffolds, supports, and extensions, as well as a variety of instructional methods that appeal to a variety of interests and needs. Renaming this section and changing the indicators expands the number of students who will be supported through the instructional materials. Supporting English Learners aligns to the ELPS and the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines and is therefore included as its own indicator here.
<b>Content and Field Experts, 2-Day Working Groups</b>	Quality materials should include resources that support content area knowledge development for teachers to help them understand the standards that they are teaching.	TEA added indicators to Section 2 of all the rubrics that require materials to be supported by research and to enrich teacher understanding of the concepts taught. Providing enrichment for educators regarding standards knowledge and research-based practices aligns with the agency's support of educator professional growth and development.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	The rubric needs a more expansive section for 'supports for all learners' - especially when these resources are usually the cornerstone for many of your learners that need differentiation.	The Supports for All Learners section contains indicators that address differentiation needs for students demonstrating content knowledge and skills above grade level, students demonstrating content knowledge and skills below grade level, and English Learners. Reviewers use the indicator guidance to call out specific examples of differentiation present in the materials so that LEAs can make decisions that best meet the needs of their students.
<b>Publisher Feedback</b>	The guidance for an indicator on Progress Monitoring says that instructional materials need to contain examples that are different than initial instruction. This implies the need to create a new RTI toolkit for every skill.	TEA revised this indicator on all rubrics to clarify the intent. Instructional materials should provide a variety of activities for teaching each concept so that teachers can choose from a different activity than that used for the initial instruction. This ensures that reteach does not need to be the same activity as initial instruction. However, there does not need to be a separate RTI toolkit for each skill.

<b>Public Comment</b>	The rubrics should include definitions of important terms such as developmentally appropriate, direct instruction, and fluency.	TEA is developing a glossary of terms to accompany the rubrics and will publish this glossary as soon as it is available. Providing a glossary of key terms adds transparency and clarity to the quality rubrics.
<b>Public Comment</b>	The rubrics – or a supporting document – should name the research used in their development.	TEA is in the process of compiling lists of research related to the rubrics and engaging content experts across the state in feedback. TEA will publish this research list as soon as it is available.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Some of the language in the rubric – particularly the indicators on technology – make it unclear whether all materials that make up a product (both print and digital) will be reviewed, or just print materials.	Publishers participating in the State Adoption process are required to submit digital/electronic access (except for Pre-K) as part of the Proclamation requirements. When reviewing each product, reviewers will note the location of relevant evidence. Additionally, information about whether products have digital or print versions is provided on the TRR website.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Several members of the public asked questions about the categorization of different sections of the rubric as “non-negotiable,” “context-specific,” or “not scored.”	TEA removed these categorizations. Instead of a categorization, each section presents a percentage score for districts to use in their local purchasing decisions.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Instructional materials should meet a higher percentage of alignment to the TEKS or Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines than the current SBOE process (>50%) in order to be on the state adoption list. This would ensure that teachers do not need to supplement their materials in order to meet the standards.	The Texas Resource Review includes the TEKS alignment in Section 1 of each quality rubric and highlights this percentage in quality review reports to support local adoptions. Greater than 50% alignment to the TEKS or Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines meets the minimum requirement for state adoption based on criteria outlined in the SBOE alignment process.

<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>The rubric design does not support ease of use of the rubric as a tool.</p>	<p>As a result of positive feedback from stakeholders, the final rubrics have the same structure as the original drafts. However, the layout of the rubric has been refined and the color scheme updated in response to feedback on ease of use. The usability of these documents will support reviewers and LEAs in using them to evaluate materials.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>In the rubrics, clarify Student TEKS, Teacher TEKS, Student ELPS, and Teacher ELPS.</p>	<p>TEA incorporated an additional sentence in Section 1, TEKS and ELPS Alignment, that explains the SBOE process results: Student TEKS, Teacher TEKS, Student ELPS, and Teacher ELPS. As a note, in the Prekindergarten Systems rubric, this clarification is on the Student Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines and Teacher Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines Alignment. The edit provides additional clarity about how TEKS, ELPS and Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines alignment is reported by the SBOE review process.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>Spiraled review is best for whole group review and is only one type of review that should be included in instructional materials. Recommend changing the language to “Materials afford teachers opportunities to discover and reteach skills not yet learned to mastery throughout the span of the curriculum.”</p> <p>Another related comment stated: what is meant by “spiraled” review?</p>	<p>TEA removed the term spiraled from the guidance within the “Implementation” section in all rubrics. Removing this term allows for multiple types of review. Reviewers will name examples of review activities included within the instructional materials so that LEAs can consider this component in their purchasing decisions.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>The first indicator in the “Progress Monitoring” section includes guidance that focuses on materials that include tools for students to</p>	<p>The “Progress Monitoring Section” is the same across all rubrics. Providing teachers with methods for helping students track and monitor their own progress is a way to help student understand their own</p>

	<p>track their own progress and growth. This may not be a realistic expectation in all contexts, especially at Grades K and 1. Student-generated data may not be accurate and reliable and may conflict with teacher-generated data.</p>	<p>growth and learning. Reviewers will call out examples of progress monitoring present in instructional materials for LEAs to review.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>Multimodal instructional strategies should be removed from the section for “Supports for All Learners” in order to better align to research on how children learn.</p>	<p>TEA revised guidance for the indicator that calls for a variety of instructional methods within the “Supports for All Learners” section across all rubrics to read “materials support developmentally appropriate instructional strategies.” The revision supports the intent of the indicator, which is to provide a variety of instructional methods that appeal to learning interests and needs. Reviewers will call out examples of the instructional methods used within an instructional material so that LEAs can consider this information in their purchasing decisions.</p>



## ELAR Foundational Literacy (K-2) Rubric: Stakeholder Feedback and TEA Response

This chart provides a summary of specific feedback received from stakeholders on the K-8 mathematics quality rubric.

Feedback Source (s)	Feedback Trend	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
<b>Literacy Content and Field Experts, 2-Day Working Group</b>	The rubric should place a greater emphasis on integration of all foundational literacy skills.	TEA created Section 2: Integration of Content, Skills, and Effective Practices, which includes six quality indicators on integration. This section is also intentionally placed after TEKS alignment in order to emphasize its importance. Connecting skills within foundational literacy aligns with the revised ELAR TEKS as well as requirements in HB 3.
<b>Literacy Content and Field Experts, 2-Day Working Group</b>	Quality materials should include resources that support teachers' understanding of content and best practices for teaching content.	TEA added guidance within Section 2, Indicator 2.3, that includes strengthening teachers' understanding of foundational literacy concepts. Providing enrichment for educators regarding standards knowledge and research-based practices aligns with the agency's support of educator professional growth and development.
<b>Literacy Content and Field Experts, 2-Day Working Group</b>	The rubric should connect foundational literacy skills to comprehension and include vocabulary development.	The section description for Section 2: Integration of Content, Skills, and Effective Practices emphasizes how building foundational skills correlates to greater reading proficiency and comprehension. This understanding is supported by the indicators within. In addition, Indicator 2.6 calls for materials to intentionally support vocabulary development.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	Rename subsection 'Phonetic Knowledge' to "Phonics" and subsection 'Oral Language' to "Oral language and Vocabulary" on the overview graphic on page 3.	TEA responded to this feedback by changing the name of subsection 3.D from "Phonetic Knowledge" to "Phonics (Encoding and Decoding)" because the name better reflects the content of that subsection. TEA acknowledges the importance of vocabulary development, which is addressed in Section 2: Integration of Content, Skills, and Effective Practices. Section 3.A remains "Oral Language."
<b>Public Comment</b>	The title of Section 3: Beginning Reading and Writing should be revised because it suggests a	TEA renamed section 3 to "Foundations of Reading and Writing" because it better reflects the content of the section and its focus on foundational literacy.

	broader purpose than what is intended in the rubric.	
<b>Public Comment</b>	The rubric needs greater clarity on the meaning of direct (explicit) instruction, systematic instruction, and continuum of skill development, as specifically related to foundational literacy instruction.	TEA is in the process of developing a glossary of important terms used in all TRR rubrics. This glossary will be released as soon as it is available and will include the meaning of these terms. Providing a glossary of key terms adds transparency and clarity to the rubrics.
<b>Public Comment</b>	In indicator 2.2, there should be a bullet aligned to the research on the gradual release of instruction in a balanced literacy model.	TEA added guidance to indicator 2.2 that supports the gradual release of responsibility model for guidance in the delivery of instruction. <b>The new guidance does not include reference to a balanced literacy model because that model is generally associated with core programs and the purpose of this rubric is to evaluate supplemental foundational literacy instructional materials.</b>
<b>Public Comment</b>	The rubric needs additional clarity on whether reading comprehension is included in oral language development.	TEA acknowledges the relationship between oral language and reading comprehension. In response to this feedback, TEA revised the third guidance bullet for indicator 3.A.2 to highlight oral language development’s connection to reading and writing and its impact on comprehension.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Diagnostic and formative assessment should be non-negotiable in K-2.	TEA removed “non-negotiable, context specific, and not scored” categorizations for the final draft of the rubric. Instead of a categorization, each section presents a percentage score for districts to consider in their local purchasing decisions. Section 4, Progress Monitoring, indicator 4.3, addresses frequent, integrated formative assessment opportunities. Reviewers will provide examples of the diagnostic and formative assessments present in instructional materials for LEAs to consider in their purchasing decisions.
<b>Public Comment</b>	The rubric is missing the importance of comprehension in	The rubric addresses the importance of comprehension in early reading in Section 2: Integration of Content, Skills, and Effective Practices. The

	<p>early reading. The way it reads now is heavy on explicit, systematic foundational instruction, but the important weight of comprehension as part of the learning to read process is missing. There must be a balance in early literacy instruction.</p>	<p>section description emphasizes how building foundational skills correlates to greater reading proficiency and comprehension.</p>
<b>Public Comment</b>	<p>The rubric should explicitly indicate that “letter of the week” should not be present within materials.</p>	<p>TEA acknowledges the need to ensure that instructional materials include effective practices for reading instruction. Section 2: Integration of Content, Skills, and Effective Practices addresses effective teaching practices by indicating that materials should follow a developmentally appropriate continuum of skill development that is research-based.</p>
<b>Public Comment</b>	<p>Vocabulary should be included in Section 3 if TEA considers it an important foundational skill.</p>	<p>TEA recognizes the importance of vocabulary development. The rubric addresses vocabulary development in Section 2: Integration of Content, Skills, and Effective Practices (Indicator 2.6).</p>
<b>Public Comment</b>	<p>Independent reading should be incorporated into the rubric.</p>	<p>TEA acknowledges that independent reading is an essential reading skill. However, the rubric does not address independent reading because this standard would be addressed in a core program rather than a supplementary program. The rubric is intended to evaluate supplementary foundational literacy skill programs.</p>
<b>Public Comment</b>	<p>Add “aural” before the word syllabication in Section 3.C.2, Phonological Awareness. Provide clarity around what is meant by “identifying syllables” in that section.</p>	<p>TEA included the word aural in the first bulleted guidance for Section 3, indicator 3.C.2 to emphasize that associated tasks are auditory. In addition, TEA has also corrected that guidance to read “detecting and counting syllables” rather than “identifying syllables.” The intention of this guidance is for reviewers to identify instructional activities in materials that focus on segmenting and detecting syllables in words spoken aloud rather than identifying or naming syllables. In addition, TEA is in the process of creating a glossary that will provide additional clarification about terms such as “phonological awareness” used with the rubric.</p>

<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>Add to indicator 3.D.2 manipulating high frequency words by adding known sound-spellings to make new words.</p>	<p>The TEKS standards related to high frequency words calls for “identifying and reading at least # high-frequency words from a research-based list.” The indicator and guidance for 3.D.2 in the final rubric focus on best practice for supporting this skill development. Therefore, the suggestion to include guidance for adding sound and spelling patterns to high-frequency words was not included in the final rubric.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>Indicator 3.D.3 is related to developing morphological awareness skills and should be included in the indicator language.</p>	<p>TEA changed the indicator to read that materials include instruction and practice for students in developing morphological awareness. The revision aligns with the intention of this indicator.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>Remove the words “reading” and “writing” in indicator 3.A.2 because this indicator is related to oral language.</p>	<p>The intention of Indicator 3.A.2 is to identify materials that integrate foundational skills with oral language development. Building the foundations for reading and writing is the purpose of this rubric. Therefore, the suggestion to remove reading and writing from this indicator was not included in the final rubric. The suggestion prompted TEA to revise the guidance for indicator 3.A.2 (bullet 3) to highlight to the relationship between oral language development and its impact on reading, writing, and comprehension.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>Highlight the rubric’s connection to Scarborough’s Rope within the rubric.</p>	<p>TEA is in the process of compiling lists of research related to the development of the rubrics and engaging content experts across the state in feedback. TEA will publish this research list as soon as it is available.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>Include building student’s background knowledge.</p>	<p>TEA added guidance on background knowledge in Section 2: Integration of Content, Skills, and Effective Practices. Connecting to students’ background knowledge and experiences is a best practice.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>It would be useful to include a definition for "foundational literacy skills" for indicator 2.5.</p>	<p>TEA is in the process of developing a glossary of important terms used in all TRR rubrics. We are engaging content experts across the state for feedback on the glossaries developed. This glossary will be released as soon as it is available and will include the meaning of these terms.</p>

		Providing a glossary of key terms adds transparency and clarity to the rubrics.
<b>Public Comment</b>	State that phonemic awareness activities are oral activities.	TEA added the word “oral” in the guidance for indicator 3.C.1 that addresses phonemic awareness skills. In addition, TEA is in the process of developing a glossary of terms used in all TRR rubrics. This glossary will be released as soon as it is available and will include the meaning of these terms.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Additional language and social studies should be grouped with reading.	Additional language is addressed in Section 7: Additional Information. TEA acknowledges that social studies-related cross-curricular learning opportunities exist in reading instruction. However, the rubric is aligned to Strand 1 Foundational Language TEKS and is not intended to cover social studies concepts; therefore, the suggestion to group social studies with reading was not included in the final rubric.

## K-8 Mathematics Rubric: Stakeholder Feedback and TEA Response

This chart provides a summary of specific feedback received from stakeholders on the K-8 mathematics quality rubric.

Feedback Source	Specific Feedback	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
<b>Mathematics Content and Field Experts, 2-Day Working Group</b>	The rubric should integrate all components of rigor in mathematics – conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and application – in order to match best practice in mathematics instruction.	TEA merged two separate sections into one section that integrates all components of rigor: Concept Development and Rigor (Section 2). The integration of all components of rigor in mathematics in the rubric matches best practice in mathematics instruction.
<b>Mathematics Content and Field Experts, 2-Day Working Group</b>	The rubric should specifically name quality tasks as the core of instructional materials.	TEA added an indicator on quality tasks [indicator 2.4 in final rubric] to the rubric posted for public comment: Materials are built around quality tasks that address content at the appropriate level of rigor and complexity. Building math instructional materials around quality tasks is a best practice supported by the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In indicator 2.1, there is a difference between “a variety of opportunities” and “multiple opportunities.” Consideration should be given to both and “such as” examples should be provided so that the reviewer has clarity.	TEA added guidance to indicator 2.1 in the final rubric on practice opportunities and noted that some of this feedback was included in indicator 2.4 on quality tasks. Reviewers will note examples of the types of practice included in the materials. LEAs can use the information provided about the types of practice opportunities to inform their purchasing decisions.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	Indicator 2.2: CRA is an instructional model. It is not a model of learning.	TEA revised indicator 2.2 in the final rubric to reflect that materials should sequence concepts from concrete to representational to abstract. Revisions based on this feedback removed the instructional model implications of CRA. The indicator is now more focused on the order in which the content is introduced within a concept.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In the guidance for indicator 2.3, a suggested addition for clarity is:	TEA added guidance to indicator 2.3 in the final rubric that reflects the provided feedback: Materials support teachers in understanding the

	Materials support teachers in understanding the horizontal and vertical alignment guiding the development of conceptual and procedural understanding.	horizontal and vertical alignment guiding the development of concepts. This additional guidance clarifies the meaning of coherence and connections between and within content at the grade level and across grade levels.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In the guidance for indicator 2.3, add more clarity to guard against a misunderstanding that more “difficult numbers” means deeper learning.	TEA recognizes the importance of providing this clarity. The content of this feedback is present in indicator 2.4 on quality tasks.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In indicator 2.4, how will “appropriate level of rigor” be defined?	The TEKS define the level of rigor in the student expectations. Reviewers use the TEKS in coordination with the rubric to evaluate whether materials meet the appropriate level of rigor for the grade level.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In indicator 2.5, add guidance on excluding timed tests as a tool for developing fluency.	Reviewers will call out examples of the fluency activities included in an instructional material for LEAs to review.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In indicator 2.6, what is meant by “repeated opportunities” and “fluent use of math vocabulary?”	TEA revised the guidance for indicator 2.6 in the final rubric for clarity: Materials include repeated embedded opportunities to develop and strengthen mathematical vocabulary. These revisions better communicate the intention of the indicator – to measure whether opportunities for development of mathematical vocabulary are embedded in instruction and lead to strengthening of this skill.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In indicator 2.6, what can be added to guard against the use and/or emphasis on key words as a language strategy?	TEA revised guidance on indicator 2.6 in the final rubric to include “use of academic mathematical vocabulary in context.” The inclusion of the need for context covers the concern about key words. Using key words removes the context and meaning of a problem.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In the guidance for indicator 2.8 [2.7 in final rubric], what is meant by “weave?” In addition, this	TEA revised this indicator 2.8 in the final rubric for clarity using the term “integrate” instead of “weave.” Materials should provide support for students in integrating knowledge and skills in order to problem solve.

	indicator should include guidance on the integration of conceptual and procedural understanding.	
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In indicator 3.a.1, add “TEKS-based” to the problem-solving model. Otherwise, a “CUBES” or “UPS” model could be applied.	TEA edited the guidance for indicator 3.A.1 in the final rubric to include that the problem-solving model must be “grounded in the TEKS.”
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In indicator 3.A.2, add guidance that helps teachers understand appropriate tools for each unit of study and how to guide students to using more efficient tools.	TEA added guidance to indicator 3.A.2 in the final rubric: Materials provide teacher guidance on tools that are appropriate and efficient for the task. This additional guidance will support teachers in deepening their understanding of mathematical tools.
<b>ESC Feedback</b>	In the guidance for indicator 3.B.3, add that the materials should provide clarity around grade-level appropriate justifications.	TEA added consideration of grade-level appropriateness to guidance for indicator 3.B.3 in the final rubric. Instructional materials should support the appropriate grade level.
<b>SBOE Member</b>	Instructional materials need to have enough opportunities for student practice. The rubric should have an indicator that evaluates the amount of student practice.	TEA incorporated this feedback as guidance in indicator 2.1 in the final rubric about the development of content in the primary focal area: Materials provide practice opportunities for students to master the content. Providing information about the student practice included in instructional materials will help LEAs choose the products that best match their instructional models.
<b>SBOE Member</b>	Indicator 2.7 [in the final rubric] should specifically name opportunities for data analysis in the application of math.	TEA added guidance on opportunities for data analysis in the real-world application of math in indicator 2.7. This change aligns to the mathematics TEKS, which include data analysis in every grade level K-8.
<b>Publisher Feedback</b>	The term “quality tasks” should be replaced with “learning experiences” in order to open up	TEA is working to develop and release a glossary of terms used in the rubric to clarify their meaning.



	the meaning for any kind of activity.	
<b>Publisher Feedback</b>	In indicator 3.A.2 on selecting appropriate tools, virtual tools (such as virtual manipulatives) should be added to the indicator.	TEA added virtual tools in the list of appropriate tools in the rubric [indicator 3.A.2 in final rubric]. Virtual tools are an example of tools that could be present for students to use.
<b>Publisher Feedback</b>	The rubric does not measure quality for programs that are intended to be adaptive learning platforms.	TEA is currently developing a long-term plan for creation of future rubrics based on LEA need and will consider rubrics that address digital tools and/or adaptive learning.
<b>Publisher Feedback</b>	There is not a specific place in the rubric that aligns to STAAR.	The rubric was built using the TEKS and Mathematical Process Standards. Quality instructional materials aligned to these standards will be aligned to STAAR.
<b>Publisher Feedback</b>	The rubric needs clarification in several indicators on whether teacher-facing or student-facing materials are reviewed. Sections 2 and 3 include language that is teacher-facing even though Sections 4-6 are dedicated to teacher-facing materials.	Sections 4-6 focus on specific supports not captured in Section 2-3. Materials need to include student- and teacher-facing components throughout that support development of content and skills for the grade level as outlined in the TEKS. Quality instructional materials also provide specific support for monitoring progress, reaching a diversity of learning needs, and providing guidance for implementation of the program.
<b>Publisher Feedback</b>	In indicator 2.1 it is helpful to quantify “majority.”	TEA revised the indicator for clarity: Materials concentrate on the development of the primary focal area(s) for the grade-level. “Majority” is not quantified. Each grade level has specific focal areas named in the introduction of the TEKS. Using the guidance provided, reviewers identify examples and evidence that demonstrate that materials are focused on the focal areas. Providing a specific percentage does not align with how the TEKS are written.

<p><b>Publisher Feedback</b></p>	<p>In indicator 2.5, integrating language for fluency and concept development makes this indicator lack focus. When defining rigor earlier in the rubric, conceptual understanding and procedural fluency are separated, acknowledging that they are inherently different.</p>	<p>TEA revised this indicator to better reflect the integrated nature of components of mathematical rigor – conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and application. The guidance states that “materials integrate fluency at appropriate times and with purpose.”</p>
<p><b>Publisher Feedback</b></p>	<p>In indicator 2.8 [indicator 2.7 in the final rubric] the first two bullets say the same thing in two different ways. The use of the word “task” seems inconsistent with this indicator.</p>	<p>TEA combined these two bullets and removed the word “task” to clarify these indicators. This revision provides more clarity to the indicator on solving real-world problems.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>In indicator 2.7, what does a “year-long plan for building fluency” mean?</p>	<p>TEA consolidated indicators and guidance on fluency for clarity. A year-long plan for building fluency is “appropriate for the concept development and grade” and occurs “at appropriate times and with purpose as students progress in conceptual understanding.” The way fluency is sequenced and taught over the course of the year is significant to a student’s development of mathematics understanding. Therefore, clarity in the rubric on this indicator was necessary.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>The rubric refers to technology as a separate component of instructional materials in indicators 6.6 and 7.1. This makes the rubric unclear as to whether it evaluates only print materials or digital as well.</p>	<p>Publishers participating in the State Adoption process for mathematics are required to submit digital/electronic access as part of the Proclamation requirements. When reviewing each product, reviewers will note the location of relevant evidence. Additionally, information about whether products have digital or print versions is provided on the TRR website.</p>

<b>Public Comment</b>	Indicator 2.2 on the CRA continuum should include bridging students along the progression.	TEA revised the guidance for this indicator to include appropriately developing students' progression along the CRA continuum. This revision strengthens the rubric's focus on the importance of teachers' understanding of the CRA continuum.
<b>Public Comment</b>	The rubric should specify that students could solve problems in more than one way.	TEA incorporated this feedback into indicator 3.A.3 in the final rubric on students selecting appropriate strategies. If instructional materials include opportunities for students to solve problems in more than one way, students will be required to show flexibility in their mathematical thinking.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Use of the term "primary focal areas" could leave the door open to loose interpretation of its meaning.	The term "primary focal areas" is used in the introduction to each grade level mathematics TEKS. Prior to reviewing materials, reviewers will receive training that includes the focal areas for each grade level, as identified in the TEKS. In addition, TEA will release a glossary of terms, including primary focal areas, to clarify the meaning of terms used in the rubric.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Textbooks should include specific group activities.	The rubric addresses implementation of a variety of types of activities in the Supports for All Learners and Implementation sections. The quality reviews will provide examples of the types of activities included in instructional materials so that LEAs can make decisions based on their local needs.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Clarify the meaning of indicator 5.1 and what will be required in instructional materials. This indicator addressed guidance, scaffolds, supports, and extensions to meet all learners.	Instructional materials could meet this indicator in different ways, and LEAs have different needs based on the needs of their students. Reviewers will name examples of the types of supports provided in instructional materials so that LEAs can make decisions that best meet their needs.
<b>Public Comment</b>	It would be helpful to see examples of instructional materials that meet and do not meet some of the indicators outlined in the rubric to	LEAs are best positioned to choose the right instructional materials for their students and teachers. TEA will not call out any specific instructional materials as examples so that decision-making remains at the local level.

	understand the evolution of instructional materials and how the rubric assists in that classification.	
<b>Public Comment</b>	Materials that are strictly fluency are important. Connecting all fluency to concept development can make the indicator lack focus.	TEA revised and consolidated the indicators on fluency in a way that is focused on integration of fluency. Fluency that is integrated with the development of concepts supports students’ understanding of its purpose. See indicator 2.5.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Recommend including opportunities to use mathematical vocabulary and writing in math.	TEA revised indicator 3.B.1 in the final rubric to include use of mathematical vocabulary and writing to communicate ideas in math, as appropriate to the task. It is important for students to be able to communicate both orally and in writing to be able to explain their ideas to others.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Some indicators use the word “require,” while others don’t. This makes these indicators seem more important.	TEA revised the language of several indicators and guidance to remove the term “require.” This term was replaced with “provide opportunities for.” This revision ensures consistency across rubric indicators.

## Prekindergarten Systems Rubric: Stakeholder Feedback and TEA Response

This chart provides a summary of specific feedback received from stakeholders on the prekindergarten systems quality rubric.

Feedback Source	Specific Feedback	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
<b>Early Childhood Content and Field Experts, 2-Day Working Group</b>	The rubric should place a greater emphasis on integration of all content domains (cross-curricular integration).	TEA created a new section – Integration of Content, Skills, and Effective Practices – which includes six quality indicators on integration. This section is also intentionally placed after the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines alignment in order to emphasize its importance. Connecting content across disciplines aligns to the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines as adopted by the SBOE in 2015. See Section 2 of the Prekindergarten Systems rubric.
<b>Early Childhood Content and Field Experts, 2-Day Working Group</b>	High-quality texts are an important part of a prekindergarten program for all content domains. Therefore, the rubric should more strongly reflect the importance of the use of texts across all content domains.	The final rubric has a quality indicator about high-quality texts in Section 2: Integration of Content, Skills, and Effective Practices: Materials utilize high-quality texts as a core component of content and skill integration. Early childhood content experts at the working groups and on TEA staff were unanimous in their emphasis on the importance of high-quality texts in prekindergarten programs.
<b>Virtual Feedback Session, Pre-k teacher</b>	Prekindergarten instructional materials should name the explicit connections between prekindergarten content and what students will learn in kindergarten.	TEA recognizes the importance of vertical alignment of content and communicating this alignment to teachers. Vertical alignment of content is addressed in the implementation section of this rubric. Reviewers will provide examples of how instructional materials address vertical alignment.
<b>Virtual Feedback Session, Early Childhood Content Expert</b>	Indicators in Section 11 are repetitive (11.A.1 and 11.B.1-3). [In the version of the rubric posted for public comment, these indicators were about implementation guidance and the developmentally appropriate nature of activities in the curriculum].	TEA removed indicators 11.A.1 and 11.A.2 from this section and included them as guidance for an indicator on developmentally appropriate practice. These indicators are important but since they refer to developmentally appropriate practices, they fit better as guidance for another indicator.

<p><b>Virtual Feedback Session, Early Childhood Content Expert</b></p>	<p>Indicator 2.3 on developmentally appropriate practice contains a lot of guidance and could be split into two indicators.</p>	<p>TEA added an indicator on developmentally appropriate practice that includes differentiation between materials for three and four-year-old children. Developmentally appropriate practice is foundational to prekindergarten and therefore can be scored with two indicators.</p>
<p><b>Publisher Feedback</b></p>	<p>Language and Writing sections currently receive the same weight. Perhaps consider favoring the Language section given the progression of learning at this age and the importance of language in accessing other skill areas.</p>	<p>TEA split listening and speaking skills into two indicators and added guidance around speech production, sentence structure, and grammar. These changes place more emphasis on language and communication and better align to the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines.</p>
<p><b>Publisher Feedback</b></p>	<p>I wonder if naming Section 3 Social Emotional Learning rather than Health and Wellness Associated Domains would be more effective in communicating the weight of this section for the overall score. Or if not, perhaps splitting the Section into Social Emotional Learning and Physical Wellness.</p>	<p>Social Emotional Learning and Physical Development domains are included in one section as Health and Wellness. This aligns with other early childhood initiatives and the Commissioner’s List of Approved Prekindergarten Assessment Instruments, which must measure Health and Wellness.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>In indicator 5.2 of the rubric, there should be an explicit connection between nursery rhymes and building phonological awareness.</p>	<p>TEA agrees that an explicit connection and clear examples would be helpful information for LEAs. Although nursery rhymes are not named in the indicator itself, the specific example of nursery rhymes will be called out by reviewers as evidence that meets this indicator if it is present in the materials.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>The rubric should include links to important additional information, such as the developmental continuum of writing and sample pre-k schedules.</p>	<p>TEA recognizes that this is important information for supporting strong teacher practices. The information requested is available in the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines and may be included as evidence in that meets specific indicators if it is present in the materials.</p>

<b>Public Comment</b>	The indicators about English Learners should be deleted or changed to include all learners.	The section of the rubric titled Supports for All Learners ensures that instructional materials are evaluated for how they support the learning needs of all students. One indicator in this section evaluates the specific supports provided in instructional materials for English Learners. This is in alignment with the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines. Therefore, this feedback was not included in the final rubric.
<b>Public Comment</b>	The rubric should be solutions to convert or correspond to the English Educational Standard.	Supporting English Learners – including through the students’ home language - is specifically and frequently present in the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines. Therefore, this feedback is not in alignment with the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines and was not implemented in the final rubric.
<b>Public Comment</b>	The rubric should include more specific examples of teacher practices in order to meet our high-quality prekindergarten requirements.	TEA recognizes the importance of meeting the rigor of the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines in instructional materials. Instructional materials can meet some indicators in different ways that match the rigor level of the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines. Reviewers provide examples of the teacher practices used in the instructional materials for LEAs to consider.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Offering an SEL connection would be prudent. A large body of research indicates that when such is spiraled into the resources used regularly, the more relevant the transfer.	The Social Emotional Learning Domain of the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines is included in the rubric under the Health and Wellness Associated Domains section.
<b>Public Comment</b>	Please include clarifying language on how resources will be judged according to their support of bilingual teachers and students. We did not see many references to bilingual support in this rubric,	TEA recognizes the importance of bilingual and Spanish language materials and quality reviews. TEA seeks to be responsive to LEA needs and is currently developing a long-term plan for creation of future rubrics, including a rubric for Spanish language and bilingual materials.

	especially in phonological awareness.	
<b>Public Comment</b>	Highlight the rubric’s connection to Scarborough’s Rope within the rubric.	The Emergent Literacy: Reading Domain section is aligned to the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines. The Texas Resource Review team has also worked to vertically align some components of all content rubrics, including Prekindergarten Systems and Foundational Literacy. Scarborough’s Reading Rope is one source of research that supported the development of these rubrics.
<b>Public Comment</b>	In the Emergent Literacy: Reading Domain section, add assessing background knowledge as a specific example in the language comprehension indicator.	In response to this feedback, TEA added consideration of student background knowledge and experiences across all domains, not just emergent literacy. TEA added guidance on background knowledge in Section 2: Integration of Content, Skills, and Effective Practices. Connecting to students’ background knowledge and experiences is a best practice.

Contact [TexasResourceReview@tea.texas.gov](mailto:TexasResourceReview@tea.texas.gov) with questions related to the Texas Resource Review rubric, Texas Resource Review Website, [www.TexasResourceReview.org](http://www.TexasResourceReview.org) (formerly known as the Instructional Materials Portal, IMP), or the quality review process.