

July 10, 2020

SUBJECT: Texas Resource Review Response to Public Comment Feedback

In May - June 2020, four Texas Resource Review rubrics were posted for a 30-day public comment period. These rubrics will be used to evaluate the quality of instructional materials in Spanish in the following subject areas: Spanish Prekindergarten Systems, Spanish Foundational Literacy, Spanish Language Arts and Reading K-2, and Spanish Language Arts and Reading 3-6. During the public comment period, TEA hosted a series of virtual working groups to obtain additional feedback from educators across Texas and shared the draft rubrics with publishers to provide feedback. In all, TEA hosted a series of five working groups for stakeholders to provide feedback throughout the entire development process, in addition to the public comment. The chart below provides a summary of feedback received during the public comment period and TEA’s response in revising and publishing the final rubrics.

| Public Comment Feedback | TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale |
|--|---|
| <p>Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness: Include more elements concerning linguistic and cultural responsiveness in Hispanic communities that respect our diversity, a clearer distinction between the different types of language BICS and CALPS development, and add more socio-cultural components and connections to students’ backgrounds. In addition, emphasize the importance of cultural relevance by naming in every section or every indicator.</p> | <p>TEA revised the introduction to the Bilingual Program Model Considerations section to include how linguistic and cultural responsiveness is addressed through the rubric and should be considered for all content indicators.</p> |
| <p>Reference to Texas Administrative Code: In the Bilingual Program Model Considerations section, it might be helpful to add the specific statement reference of "Materials provide clear guidance specific to the bilingual program and ESL program models as stated in Texas regulation §89.1210. Program Content and Design."</p> | <p>TEA added reference to the Texas Administrative Code on the four approved bilingual education program models in Texas in order to clarify and strengthen the connection between the content of these rubrics and statute.</p> |
| <p>Specificity on the Four Program Models: The bilingual program models section be split into four separate sections based on the model for the materials. In addition, the rubric should have some guiding principles explaining more about what each more looks and feels like.</p> | <p>The purpose of inclusion of the four approved models is to gather evidence from materials and publishers about how materials could be used in the approved program models. Further guidance for LEAs can also be found in the English Learner Program Implementation Resources, which includes all aspects of program implementation, not just instructional materials. In addition, when reviewers use this section of the rubric to review materials, they will have</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>access to some more specific, high-quality examples of what this looks like in each model to support their review. Lastly, TEA seeks to respond to this feedback by adding introductory information on each product on the Texas Resource Review website that explains the intent of the product in order to support LEA selection.</p> |
| <p>Bridging Activities: On the guidance descriptor that states "Materials support bilingual teachers with implementation within transitional or dual language immersion programs" it would be beneficial that the resource states content that can be bridged from one language to another.</p> | <p>Bridging activities are specific examples that reviewers could cite as evidence in their reviews of the instructional materials. Specific examples are not mentioned within the rubric language itself but are instead named as examples of evidence that meets rubric guidance.</p> |
| <p>Cultural and Linguistic Diversity of Spanish: In the indicator "Materials in Spanish are authentic and culturally relevant," add that materials also represent cultural and linguistic diversity and not focus solely on cultural relevance from one country and its dialect, such as from Mexico.</p> | <p>TEA added guidance to this indicator: Materials represent the cultural and linguistic diversity of the Spanish language and Hispanic culture. This addition responds to the feedback and ensures that reviewers will seek evidence of cultural and linguistic diversity present in the instructional materials.</p> |
| <p>Glossary of Terms: Include a glossary for some terms, including phonetic knowledge, phonics, phonological skills, and progress monitoring.</p> | <p>TEA is in the process of developing a glossary and obtaining feedback from experts in the field. A glossary will be released for use by reviewers.</p> |
| <p>Audio Component of Materials: The audio component of curricula is not mentioned in the rubric, and it is very important to include for prekindergarten.</p> | <p>The inclusion of audio components in instructional materials, such as music or audiobooks, would be examples of high-quality evidence that reviewers could identify to meet specific indicators. Audio components would not be included in the rubrics themselves.</p> |
| <p>Instructional Strategies: Bilingual program model considerations should include proven instructional strategies teachers can use to implement in their classroom effectively.</p> | <p>TEA revised the guidance within the Bilingual Program Model Considerations section to read: Materials include guidance or recommendations on how they could be applied within a particular bilingual program model. This revision includes instructional strategies. In addition, the rubric includes guidance on citing relevant research, which could also include proven instructional strategies.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Equity of Language Instruction: The Bilingual Program Model Considerations section of the rubric would benefit from the inclusion of the following in order to support the instruction in both languages: The materials provide examples as to how to teach concepts in both languages equitably.</p> | <p>TEA added guidance to this indicator: Materials allow for equitable instruction in both languages, in terms of quality and quantity of materials. This revision reflects the provided feedback and ensures that materials could be implemented in a variety of bilingual program models.</p> |
| <p>Translation, Transadaptation, and Authentic Spanish: On the subject of translation, transadaptation, and authentic Spanish texts – any of these can be appropriate, depending on the purpose and intention of the activity. Revise to include dependent on the context and purpose of the activity.</p> | <p>TEA revised guidance to read: Both teacher and student materials are presented in authentic and academic Spanish or are quality transadaptations or translations, as appropriate for the purpose and context of the activity. This revision will guide reviewers to consider the purpose of the activity and what is most appropriate for that activity.</p> |
| <p>Technology: Everything that's being evaluated can be delivered via hard copy materials or technology so it should be evaluated that way. Technology can improve delivery because it enables "sight, sound, and motion" and allows students to learn anywhere. So, vendors that provide enhanced content (for example, real-life videos vs. static pages/flashcards) should get a higher score. The way the rubric is set up now, it does not allow for that.</p> | <p>Reviewers will note evidence from the instructional materials on the technology and the way that it is used. The rubric does not currently rate the format of the instructional delivery, and instead provides information that LEAs can use to make decisions for their local contexts.</p> |
| <p>Word Choice: Throughout public comment feedback opportunities, educators provided feedback on the specific word choice for terms in Spanish.</p> | <p>TEA considered all feedback on specific term usage and incorporated feedback as relevant, with attention to consistency of terms within and across rubrics.</p> |
| <p>Specific Examples of Cross-Linguistic Transfer: In the Bilingual Program Model Considerations section, add an appreciation for the distinction of concepts that do not need to be retaught in the other language but are instead a continuation.</p> | <p>Reviewers will note specific examples of the ways in which the materials address cross-linguistic transfer for LEAs to consider. The suggested specific examples could appear in reviews but would not be named specifically in the rubric. Instead, LEAs can consider the examples of cross-linguistic transfer and use this information to make decisions for their local contexts. In addition, the rubrics specifically note the skills that should be taught in Spanish.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Spanish Language Arts and Reading TEKS: Wherever there are references to the TEKS in the SLAR rubrics, specifically name the SLAR TEKS so that there could be no confusion that materials could be aligned to the ELAR TEKS and directly translated.</p> | <p>TEA responded to this feedback by modifying references to the TEKS to refer to the SLAR TEKS, specifically. As stated in the feedback, this revision further ensures that reviewers ground their review in the SLAR TEKS.</p> |
| <p>Progress Monitoring: In the SLAR K-2 rubric, there are duplicative indicators on progress monitoring in the Developing and Sustaining Foundational Skills section and the Progress Monitoring section.</p> | <p>TEA removed the indicators on progress monitoring from the Developing and Sustaining Foundational Skill section, as these indicators are addressed in the Progress Monitoring section of the rubric.</p> |

Contact TexasResourceReview@tea.texas.gov with questions related to the Texas Resource Review rubric, Texas Resource Review website, www.TexasResourceReview.gov, or the quality review process.