# ELA Curriculum/Textbook Review

## Introduction

The adoption committee for the elementary ELA curriculum consisted of classroom teachers, support staff, ELA Implementation Specialists, administrators, and district Implementation Specialists. The Nevada textbook rubric scoring system was used by the adoption committee to determine the alignment of each publisher using the Nevada Classroom Instructional Material Alignment, and Textbook and Instructional Material rubrics. Publishers who were not selected were scored lower by the committee, thus, these textbooks scored lower in areas such as alignment to district curriculum, alignment to NVACS, multilingual components, technology, and application to real world experiences, etc.. It was through this process of rubric scoring that the team determined that Houghton Mifflin Harcourt: Into Reading was best aligned with the NVACS, and NGSS, as well as the MIUs that were developed by the ELA Implementation Specialists during the 2017-2018 school year.

## Into Reading, HMH (Recommended Curriculum/Textbook

This program received a near perfect score from all committee members and scored noticeably higher than the next best program. The only area that it scored inadequate was access to a multilingual glossary. The program did however include common cognates for multiple languages in the teacher's edition. The program is aligned to the NVACS and the texts as well as questions are at a high level of rigor. The program includes a robust assessment system. Scaffolding and extension activities are describe throughout the teacher's edition. The program has a Writers Workshop that emphasizes writing curriculum. Student texts are available in English and Spanish as well as online. The structure of the program supports the work done with the ELA MIUs. The program also has Close reading, Notes and Notice, and Growth Mindset embedded in the program, all of which support current practices in Carson City.

## Fountas and Pinnell Classroom, Heinemann

This program scored well on the rubric form but had some areas of concern. While there was indications of content vocabulary being addressed, the program does not focus on academic vocabulary. The committee have concerns over how well the assessment questions aligned to the SBAC. While the program included some response to literature there was little language instruction. The structure of the program supports the work done with the ELA MIUs. While the program scored well overall, the committee ranked this program lower because there were concerns with the vocabulary, writing, and assessments pieces of the program.

## Readygen, Pearson

This program scored well on the rubric form but had some areas of concern. The program scored well on the content section of the rubric with the major concern being around the range and quality of text. The program is very heavy on informational text with only 12 trade books for students. The committee felt that the differentiation piece of the program was not strong

for interventions and did not have extension activities. The teacher's edition did not have a strong organizational structure and the committee felt it was difficult to follow. There was not a strong alignment to the district MIUs for ELA.

**My View, Pearson**

This program scored well on the rubric form but had some areas of concern. The committee felt that this program was not rigorous enough in K and 1 but met the level of rigor in grades 2-5. The program had a focus on content vocabulary but is lacking in academic vocabulary. The assessment system that is built into the program did not have SBAC type assessment questions. The committee felt that the intervention component of the program was weak and there was little acceleration. The program is very heavy on informational text and the committee felt the texts are not high interest. Many committee members felt that the lower grade levels were not aligned to NVACS. The structure of the program supports the work done with the ELA MIUs.

**Wonders, McGraw Hill**

Overall Wonders scored low on both rubrics. While the teacher's edition identified the DOK level of questions students would answer during lessons the vast majority of the questioning was at a DOK 1 or 2. The majority of committee members scored the writing aspect of the program as inadequate. The program did not demonstrate a strong emphasis on student discourse. There was not a strong alignment to the district MIUs for ELA.

**Benchmark Advance, Benchmark Learning**

Overall the committee scored this program low. The main areas were the program scored low dealt with the overall structure of the teachers edition, a lack of focus on academic vocabulary, and limited examples or explanations to the depth of the NVACS. The committee was also concerned with the level of questioning through the units. The texts for student reading were very heavy on informational and were perceived as lower interest texts. There was not a strong alignment to the district MIUs for ELA.