

Texas Resource Review Response to K–8 and High School Science Quality Rubrics Public Comments

This chart provides a summary of specific feedback received from stakeholders on grades K–8 and High School Science quality rubric and TEA’s response.

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 and adoption processes.

Summarized Comment	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
<p>General: It would be helpful to include a glossary for frequency terms (e.g., consistently, multiple opportunities).</p>	<p>TEA will add a glossary to the rubric that defines frequency terms. The glossary will be available by the end of the year.</p>
<p>Introduction: On page 1, it may be helpful to include some clarification on the term "program," as this term could indicate more than just a resource under consideration for purchase.</p>	<p>The word “program” was replaced with “instructional materials” to improve clarity. We will define “instructional materials” in the glossary.</p>
<p>Introduction: On page 3, the terms Student TEKS and Teacher TEKS are unclear.</p>	<p>This data represents the percentage of TEKS that are covered in the student materials and the teacher materials. For clarification, TEA added “%” to the end of each label. The percentage of TEKS covered in the student and teacher materials will be included in the final TRR reports.</p>
<p>Section 1: The rubric states, “to be eligible for adoption by the State Board of Education, instructional materials must meet at least 50% of the TEKS and 100% of the required ELPS in the components intended for student use and the components intended for teacher use” The materials should cover 100% of the TEKS.</p>	<p>TEA did not make this change. Texas Education Code, Chapter 31, requires the SBOE to adopt materials that cover at least half of the TEKS. Districts must certify each year prior to accessing allotment funds that they have materials that cover 100% of the TEKS (TEC §31.0213). That can be a single material for a given subject or a combination of materials. To raise the minimum threshold of TEKS coverage, the legislature would have to change the law. The actual TEKS percentage will be included in the Texas Resource Review report.</p>

Summarized Comment	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
<p>Indicator 2.1: When looking at the scientific and engineering practices language, that is what teachers associate with labs. I would like to see the word embedded and that students apply knowledge.</p>	<p>TEA added the following guidance bullet:</p> <p>K–8: Materials include sufficient opportunities for students to engage in classroom, laboratory, and field investigations and problem-solving to make connections across disciplines and develop understanding of science concepts.</p> <p>HS: Materials include sufficient opportunities for students to engage in classroom, laboratory, and field investigations and problem-solving to develop understanding of science concepts.</p>
<p>Indicator 2.1: The first guidance bullet seems redundant. My recommendation would be to keep the last three but not the first one.</p>	<p>The first bullet was deleted to avoid redundancy.</p>
<p>Indicator 2.1: On the high school rubric, add course-level content as defined in the TEKS.</p>	<p>TEA made this change and edited the indicator by adding “as outlined in the TEKS.”</p>
<p>Indicator 2.1 "Recurring themes are not specifically identified as a standard in the HS courses so I don't feel it is appropriate to use that as criteria" [Comment applies to 9–12 rubric only.]</p>	<p>TEA deleted recurring themes throughout the high school rubric.</p>
<p>Indicator 2.2: The first guidance bullet does not align with the indicator. It should read "phenomena AND engineering problems" vs. "phenomena OR problems."</p>	<p>The word “and” was added in the science indicator to be consistent with the TEKS.</p>
<p>Indicator 2.2: Include “science problems” with “phenomena.”</p>	<p>TEA did not make this change. In the indicator, phenomena refers to detectable events that are observed through the senses or technology and can be explained through scientific laws, ideas, principles, and theories, which would include science problems.</p>
<p>Indicator 2.2: Can phenomena be narrowed down further by using “relevant” or “local” in the second guidance bullet?</p>	<p>Language was changed to read; “Materials are designed to include relevant phenomena...” and relevant phenomena will be further defined in the glossary to include connections to student’s local context.</p>
<p>Indicator 3.1 and 3.2: The bullet points appear to be redundant.</p>	<p>TEA condensed the three science indicators to two science indicators to avoid redundancy.</p>

Summarized Comment	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
Indicator 3.2: The use of the wording “intentional sequencing” is unclear.	Indicator 3.2 was removed and some of the guidance bullets were moved to indicator 3.1. The guidance bullet that originally contained “intentional sequencing” was changed to read, “Materials are intentionally sequenced to scaffold learning in a way that allows for increasingly deeper conceptual understanding.” The focus of this guidance bullet is to provide guidance on the order in which content should be taught. Indicator 8.3 focuses on the guidance provided regarding the amount of time that should be spent on each lesson. TEA will add a glossary and include a definition of intentional sequencing.
Indicator 3.3: Suggest using “background knowledge” instead of “self-knowledge” to support teacher development in the first guidance bullet.	TEA made a change in the first guidance bullet to replace “self-knowledge” with to “teacher’s subject knowledge”
Indicator 4,1: Consider the use of the term "persistence" in place of "productive struggle or “connections in place of “sensemaking.”	TEA did not make this change. The terms will be defined in the glossary.
Indicator 4.1: Consider adding language around support for scientific writing.	The support was added under Educator Supports.
Indicator 4.1: In the fourth guidance bullet use “scientists or engineers” instead of “scientists and engineers” to not treat the terms a separate.	TEA did not make this change. The TEKS, at all grade levels, emphasize student participation in scientific and engineering practices. Changing the wording to “scientists or engineers” would imply that materials could do one or the other but do not have to do both.
Indicator 5.1: "Hypotheses" would be a better term than "opinions."	Change was made to reflect suggestion, “Materials prompt students to use evidence to support their hypotheses and claims to align with scientific language.”
Indicator 5.1: Consider edits to narrow down focus of student actions.	Change made to simplify language and focus on student actions, “Materials promote students’ use of evidence to develop, communicate, and evaluate explanations and solutions”

Summarized Comment	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
Indicator 5.1: Use "argumentation and discourse" and not "discussion" in the third guidance bullet.	Change made to include "argumentation and discourse" for clarity and alignment with the TEKS
Indicator 5.1: Consider the word choice in the second guidance bullet to increase accountability for students to use vocabulary.	Language was changed from "strengthen" to "utilize" to increase student accountability.
Indicator 5.1: Consider removing "using evidence" from the final bullet point due to redundancy.	TEA did not make a change. The TEKS specifically have "use evidence" with scientific and engineering practices.
Indicator 5.2: The first guidance bullet can be improved by adding teacher guidance on anticipating both correct and incorrect student responses.	TEA did not make a change. Both correct and incorrect student responses are implied with "student responses"
Indicator 5.2: Provide consistent feedback for educators around providing exemplars of writing to best support students in skill building.	Added as a bullet point, "Materials provide teacher guidance on preparing for student discourse and supporting students in using evidence to written and verbal claims"
Indicator 5.2: Suggestion changing "anticipating" to "anticipation of" and "their" to "student" In the first guidance bullet.	Changes were made for clarity. The guidance now reads, "Materials provide teacher guidance on the anticipation of student responses and the use of questions to deepen student thinking."
Indicator 5.2: Clarify the term heavy thinking.	TEA updated the indicator to read, "Materials provide teacher guidance to support student reasoning and communication skills."
Indicator 6.1: "Diagnostic tools" sounds like a technical word to evaluate student learning and suggest common descriptors like informal, formal, or summative assessment.	The indicator and associated guidance bullets were updated to replace diagnostic tools with assessment tools. "Additionally, the first guidance bullet was updated to read, "Materials include a range of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments that include formal and informal opportunities to assess student learning in a variety of formats."
Indicator 6.2: Consider adding "planning for intervention and extension" in the third guidance bullet	TEA made this change.
Indicator 6.3: Consider replacing the word "meaningful" with "relevant" in the third guidance bullet point.	TEA made this change.

Summarized Comment	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
Indicator 6.3: The fourth guidance bullet is unclear.	TEA changed the guidance bullet to read, “Materials include guidance to offer accommodations for assessment tools that allow students to demonstrate mastery of knowledge and skills aligned to learning goals.”
Indicator 6.3: Remove “well written” to reduce subjectivity in the first guidance bullet.	TEA made this change and removed “well written.”
Indicator 7.1 Clarity is needed in the second guidance bullet.	TEA deleted the second guidance bullet because it was duplicative of the third guidance bullet.
Indicator 7.2: Consider changing “developmentally” appropriate to “scientifically appropriate” in the first guidance bullet.	TEA did not make this change. This language speaks to where the students are cognitively. The scientific instructional approaches were addressed in Sections 2 through 5.
Indicator 7.4: The first guidance bullet point cannot be evaluated.	TEA deleted the guidance bullet. “
Indicator 8.1: The first guidance bullet is too large to evaluate,	TEA deleted the second part of the bullet point, however moved the first part to 3.1.
Indicator 8.3: Suggest moving the third guidance bullet to the top and re-write the third bullet point, “Materials support scheduling considerations and include guidance and recommendations on required time for lessons and activities.”	TEA made both changes.
Anchor Statement 9: Consider changing the anchor statement to read, “Materials are intentionally designed and engage and support student learning with the integration of digital technology.”	TEA did not make this change on the Anchor Statement because the suggestion does not match the intent of the Design Features section of the rubric; however, Science Indicator 9.2 was updated to match the suggestion provided.
Indicator 9.1: Consider adding a bullet point for materials to be age appropriate.	TEA modified the second guidance bullet to include “age appropriate.” The guidance now reads, “Materials embed age-appropriate pictures and graphics that support student learning and engagement without being visually distracting.”

Summarized Comment	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
Indicator 9.2: Consider adding an additional guidance bullet that reads, “Materials integrate with a variety of Learning Management Systems.”	TEA added a fourth guidance bullet that reads, “Materials integrate digital technology that is compatible with a variety of learning management systems.”