Texas Resource Review Response Public Comments on the K-8 and High School Second Draft Science Quality Rubrics (Updated 10/28/2022)

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

Written into statue 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.

Indicator	Summarized Comment	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
2.1	In the third bullet, will "sufficient opportunities" be quantified for the reviewers so they can consistently and reliably score this indicator? How much is considered "sufficient?"	TEA will add a glossary to the rubric that defines frequency terms. The glossary will be available by the end of the year.
2.1	In the fourth point, I would like to see sufficient opportunities better defined to be aligned with the TEKS time and I would like the rubric to include wording around students designing their own investigations.	TEA will add a glossary to the rubric that defines frequency terms. The glossary will be available by the end of the year. TEA made the following changes for clarity and alignment to the TEKS: K–8: Materials include sufficient opportunities, as outlined in the TEKS, for students to ask questions and plan and conduct classroom, laboratory, and field investigations and to engage in problem-solving to make connections across disciplines and develop understanding of science concepts. 9–12: Materials include sufficient opportunities, as outlined in the TEKS, for students to ask questions and plan and conduct classroom, laboratory, and field investigations and to engage in problem-solving to develop understanding of science concepts.

Indicator	Summarized Comment	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
2.2	The first two guidance bullets appear to be redundant. Not sure how "construct, build, and develop" the three dimensions as outlined in the TEKS is different from "develop and apply" the three dimensions as outlined in the TEKS.	TEA combined the first and second bullets for clarity. K–8 Combined to read: Materials embed phenomena and problems across lessons to support students to in constructing, building, and developing knowledge through authentic application and performance of scientific and engineering practices, recurring themes and concepts, and grade-level content as outlined in the TEKS. 9–12 Combined to read: Materials embed phenomena and problems across lessons to support students to in constructing, building, and developing knowledge through authentic application and performance of scientific and engineering practices and grade-level content as outlined in the TEKS.
2.2	In the first bullet: the word "engineering" is omitted, although this is probably not consequential given that it is elsewhere in this indicator.	TEA removed the specificity of "engineering problems" from the indicator statement and guidance bullets to be consistent with the TEKS. In K–12, the TEKS consistently use "engineering" to define the practices, not the problems. K–12 rubrics were modified to read: Materials anchor the learning in phenomena and problems as the key lever for driving learning and student mastery of disciplinary knowledge and skills.
3.2	The scoring box is missing its 0/3/6 numbers.	TEA added the appropriate scoring box 0/3/6.
3.2	In the first bullet: Please define your usage of “vertical alignment” and clarify expectations in the context of high school science.	TEA added clarifying language 9–12 rubric was changed to read: Materials support teachers in understanding the vertical alignment of course-appropriate prior knowledge and skills guiding the development of course-level content and scientific and engineering practices

Indicator	Summarized Comment	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
4.1 and 4.5	In the third bullet (4.1) first and fourth bullets (5.1) appear redundant. All three are about using evidence. Two of the three specify "in scientific writing" or "written" as being included. It would seem better to consolidate these, especially so they are not split across different sections, to prevent "double jeopardy."	TEA made changes to 4.1 for clarification: K–12 rubrics were changed to read: Materials provide multiple opportunities for students to engage in various written and graphic modes of communication to support students in developing and displaying understanding of scientific concepts. No changes were made to indicator 5.1 because the first and third bullets refer to evidence being used in different stages of the scientific process.
4.1	I would like to see an indicator that captures whether the resource has labs where students are planning the procedures for investigations (guided inquiry), or whether all the labs in the resource are written at the confirmation inquiry level. (The 1.A and 1.B of the high school course TEKS)	TEA did not make a change because a change was made to indicator 2.1 to address concern.
5.2	In the first bullet: please clarify “guidance on anticipating student responses”; should this be “anticipated student responses”, in that guidance is expected for likely student responses?	TEA did not make a change because the guidance bullet is related to the teacher's actions not the students. Guidance on student responses is covered in indicator 6.2.
6.3	With STAAR changing to use a variety of item types, I would like to see the publisher's assessments follow suit with offering unit/chapter assessments that incorporate a variety of ways for students to demonstrate their knowledge. The pre-made assessments in our previous and current resources in our district have only provided multiple choice tests.	The rubric addresses the use of different variety of assessments in indicator 6.1 in bullet one.
7.1	In the third bullet point, there are many competing interpretations about what "acceleration" means, and whether "acceleration" is appropriate for all students, as the guidance states. It would be helpful if the intent of this guidance was clarified.	TEA will add a glossary to the rubric that defines frequency terms. The glossary will be available by the end of the year.
8.1	In the first bullet specify what the “scope and sequence” should show in the high school context. A “scope and sequence” is usually used to show year-to-year progression.	TEA made the change for clarification. 9–12 rubric was updated to read: Materials are accompanied by a TEKS-aligned scope and sequence outlining the order in which knowledge and skills are taught and built in the course materials.

Indicator	Summarized Comment	TEA Response to Feedback and Rationale
8.2	In the second bullet "cross-content standards" should be clarified or specified.	TEA will add a glossary to the rubric that defines frequency terms. The glossary will be available by the end of the year and “cross-content standards” will be explained further in the evidence guides.
9.2	The words distracting or chaotic is subjective. Perhaps provide examples and non-examples.	TEA did not make a change. This will be explained further using examples and non-examples provided in the evidence guides.
10.1	Provide the TRR definition of the devices in the Device Compatibility section. Define eBook	TEA did not make a change. TEA will provide guidance to publishers regarding how to complete the forms in section 10 in the publisher handbook.
10.1	Define how student data is purged after use by the product. If yes, indicate how and when below. Are data elements encrypted at rest (i.e. in a database or file system) If yes, specify which data elements are encrypted below IMS CASE.	TEA did not make a change. TEA will provide guidance to publishers regarding how to complete the forms in section 10 in the publisher handbook.
None (General Comment)	I do not see anything specifically about Tier 1-Tier 3 strategies. I do not see anything specifically discussing differentiation. I do not see anything about vocabulary use or strategies.	TEA did not make a change. Vocabulary is listed in indicators 5.1 and 6.2, differentiation is addressed in indicator 6.2, and scaffolding is listed several times in the document.
None (General Comment)	The description associated with Productive Struggle: the phrase 'the heavy thinking' should not be hyphenated. I also feel like this phrase is too colloquial for such a document. Recommend something like "applying disciplinary practices to engage in deep thinking."	TEA made an updated the description for Productive Struggle to ensure TEKS alignment and improve clarity. K–12 rubrics were updated to read: Materials are designed to support students in applying disciplinary practices to engage in critical thinking and scientific decision-making.