

LA/ELP 6-12 Materials Selection Committee Publisher Presentation Rubric Results

Four selected publishers presented their LA/ELP curriculum materials to the committee on January 14, 2025. The committee was divided into five groups and assigned specific criteria to rank based on the attached rubric. Each member submitted their rankings. Note: Not all members responded to every criterion. Two rankings were given, one for Middle School and one for High School.

Criterion	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3
	Middle	High	(little to no) Middle	(little to no) High	(some) Middle	(some) High	(frequent) Middle	(frequent) High
Carnegie								
High-Quality Text					2	2	3	3
Evidence-Based Discussion and Writing							5	5
Building Knowledge					1	1	4	4
Range & Quality of Text			1		2	2	3	3
Questions, Tasks & Assignments					5	5		
Building Knowledge with Text, Vocabulary and Tasks			1	1	5	5		
Access to Standards for All Students			2	2	4	4		
Cultural Representation in Texts & Curriculum					4	4		
Accessibility/Usability			1		3	4	1	1
Culturally & Linguistically Responsive			3	2	3	2		
Differentiation			1	1	4	4		
Comprehensive Literacy Integration			1	1	1	1	3	3
Teacher Usability & Alignment			1	1	2	2	2	2
Engagement & Rigor					1	2	4	4

LA/ELP 6-12 Materials Selection Committee Publisher Presentation Rubric Results

Four selected publishers presented their LA/ELP curriculum materials to the committee on January 14, 2025. The committee was divided into five groups and assigned specific criteria to rank based on the attached rubric. Each member submitted their rankings. Note: Not all members responded to every criterion. Two rankings were given, one for Middle School and one for High School.

Criterion	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3
	Middle	High	(little to no) Middle	(little to no) High	(some) Middle	(some) High	(frequent) Middle	(frequent) High
Authenticity in the Teaching & Learning of the Program Languages	4	4						
Metalinguistic Connections	3	3	1	1				
Aligned to Updated Research about Dual Language/Bilingual Education	4	4						
Total Carnegie	0	1	2	3				
	14	22	71	48				

Total Carnegie Responses Received: 157

McGraw Hill

High-Quality Text					1	1	4	4
Evidence-Based Discussion and Writing					1		3	4
Building Knowledge						1	5	4
Range & Quality of Text						1	4	4
Questions, Tasks & Assignments					1	1	5	5
Building Knowledge with Text, Vocabulary and Tasks					1	1	4	4

LA/ELP 6-12 Materials Selection Committee Publisher Presentation Rubric Results

Four selected publishers presented their LA/ELP curriculum materials to the committee on January 14, 2025. The committee was divided into five groups and assigned specific criteria to rank based on the attached rubric. Each member submitted their rankings. Note: Not all members responded to every criterion. Two rankings were given, one for Middle School and one for High School.

Criterion	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3
	Middle	High	(little to no) Middle	(little to no) High	(some) Middle	(some) High	(frequent) Middle	(frequent) High
Access to Standards for All Students					2	2	4	4
Cultural Representation in Texts & Curriculum					2	2	1	1
Accessibility/Usability			1	1			1	1
Culturally & Linguistically Responsive								
Differentiation					2	2	1	1
Comprehensive Literacy Integration							3	3
Teacher Usability & Alignment					4	4		
Engagement & Rigor					5	4		1
Authenticity in the Teaching & Learning of the Program Languages			3	3				
Metalinguistic Connections	4	4			1	1		
Aligned to Updated Research about Dual Language/Bilingual Education	3	4						
Total McGraw Hill	0	1	2	3				
		(little to no)	(some)	(frequent)				

LA/ELP 6-12 Materials Selection Committee Publisher Presentation Rubric Results

Four selected publishers presented their LA/ELP curriculum materials to the committee on January 14, 2025. The committee was divided into five groups and assigned specific criteria to rank based on the attached rubric. Each member submitted their rankings. Note: Not all members responded to every criterion. Two rankings were given, one for Middle School and one for High School.

Criterion	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3
	Middle	High	(little to no) Middle	(little to no) High	(some) Middle	(some) High	(frequent) Middle	(frequent) High
	15	8	48	73				

Total McGraw Hill Responses Received: 144

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt

High-Quality Text					1	1	4	4
Evidence-Based Discussion and Writing						1	5	4
Building Knowledge					3	3	3	3
Range & Quality of Text					1	1	4	4
Questions, Tasks & Assignments			1	1	3	3		
Building Knowledge with Text, Vocabulary and Tasks			1	1	2	2	1	1
Access to Standards for All Students			1	1	3	3		
Cultural Representation in Texts & Curriculum			1	1	3	3	1	1
Culturally & Linguistically Responsive					4	4		
Differentiation					4	4		
Comprehensive Literacy Integration							5	5
Teacher Usability & Alignment					1	1	4	4

LA/ELP 6-12 Materials Selection Committee Publisher Presentation Rubric Results

Four selected publishers presented their LA/ELP curriculum materials to the committee on January 14, 2025. The committee was divided into five groups and assigned specific criteria to rank based on the attached rubric. Each member submitted their rankings. Note: Not all members responded to every criterion. Two rankings were given, one for Middle School and one for High School.

Criterion	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3
	Middle	High	(little to no) Middle	(little to no) High	(some) Middle	(some) High	(frequent) Middle	(frequent) High
Access to Standards for All Students					1		4	5
Cultural Representation in Texts & Curriculum			1	1			3	3
Culturally & Linguistically Responsive					1	1	3	3
Differentiation					2	2	2	2
Comprehensive Literacy Integration							5	5
Teacher Usability & Alignment							5	5
Engagement & Rigor							5	5
Authenticity in the Teaching & Learning of the Program Languages		5	5					
Metalinguistic Connections		4	4	1	1			
Aligned to Updated Research about Dual Language/Bilingual Education	2	5	3					
Total Savvas	0	1	2	3				
	16	(little to no) 13	(some) 9	(frequent) 114				

LA/ELP 6-12 Materials Selection Committee Publisher Presentation Rubric Results

Four selected publishers presented their LA/ELP curriculum materials to the committee on January 14, 2025. The committee was divided into five groups and assigned specific criteria to rank based on the attached rubric. Each member submitted their rankings. Note: Not all members responded to every criterion. Two rankings were given, one for Middle School and one for High School.

Criterion	0 Middle	0 High	1 (little to no) Middle	1 (little to no) High	2 (some) Middle	2 (some) High	3 (frequent) Middle	3 (frequent) High
Total Savvas Responses Received: 152								
Total Carnegie	0	1 (little to no)	2 (some)	3 (frequent)				
	14	22	71	48				
Total Carnegie Responses Received: 157								
Total McGraw Hill	0	1 (little to no)	2 (some)	3 (frequent)				
	15	8	48	73				
Total McGraw Hill Responses Received: 144								
Total Houghton Mifflin Harcourt	0	1 (little to no)	2 (some)	3 (frequent)				
	22	16	51	63				
Total Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Responses Received: 152								
Total Savvas	0	1 (little to no)	2 (some)	3 (frequent)				
	16	13	9	114				
Total Savvas Responses Received: 152								

Carnegie

- No whole class book clubs
- Lesson plans with supports - where are vocabulary, grammar, graphic organizers, etc?
- Exemplars are online, all writing is online
- Teacher portal online
- Fiction?
- Aligned rubrics?
- No Dual Language
- Has translation and listening but no scaffolds beyond glossary and translations
- Only differentiated the core
- How does pacing affect SpEd students?
- Feels very canned. Where's the room for teacher responsiveness and creativity?
- Where no novels and book clubs fit?
- Do we want students to be on screens even more?
- Digital first hand, copy second. Is that what we want?
- Classroom libraries - no student agency
- Think through middle and high school - materials for needs and staff at both levels

Mcgraw Hill

- Hard to assess without seeing materials
- Pieces of it will work, but loads of teacher time to pull pieces together
- Maybe good for credit recovery
- Has rubrics with options to create your own

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt

- Supported integration appears more comprehensive than others
- Lack of translations across text types
- No hardback class set text book

Savvas

- Classroom libraries are excellent
- Classroom libraries - digital English and authentic Spanish text
- Dual Language resources under development
- Top choice by far

BSD LA/ELP Instructional Materials' Rubric (6-12)

Circle the text under the score for each

Criterion	1 ("little to no")	2 ("some")	3 ("frequent" or "majority")
<p>High-Quality Text (Group 1)</p> <p>Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p> <p>High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p>	Little or no evidence of rigorous academic language in anchor texts.	Some of the anchor texts contain rich academic language, meeting appropriate complexity criteria for each grade.	Anchor texts are high-quality and rigorous, containing rich academic language, meeting appropriate complexity criteria for each grade.
	There are no series' texts or they have little to no evidence of varying complexity levels.	Some of the texts that are part of a series do vary in complexity levels but it is consistent.	Texts that are part of a series or chosen to build knowledge should vary in complexity levels.
	Little to no attention to high-quality nonfiction text.	Includes some attention to high-quality nonfiction text.	Includes substantial attention to high-quality nonfiction text.
<p>Evidence-Based Discussion and Writing (Group 1)</p> <p>Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p> <p>High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p>	Less than 50% of questions, tasks, and assignments are text-dependent. There is little to no evidence that students are required to draw on text evidence.	50%-80% of questions, tasks, and assignments are text-dependent which requires students to draw on textual evidence about half the time to support both what is explicit as well as valid inferences from the text.	At least 80% of all questions, tasks, and assignments are text-dependent, requiring students to draw on textual evidence to support both what is explicit as well as valid inferences from the text.
	There is little to no opportunity for evidence-based discussions and writing for analytical or critical thinking.	The materials include some opportunity for evidence-based discussions and writing to support analytical or critical thinking.	Materials include frequent opportunities for evidence-based discussions and writing to support careful analyses, well-defended claims, and clear information about texts to address the analytical thinking required by the Standards at each grade level.

<p>Building Knowledge (Group 1) Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p> <p>High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p>	<p>There is little to no evidence of series of texts that are used to build knowledge around a variety of topics.</p>	<p>The materials provide series' texts that build knowledge and vocabulary but it is not done in a systematic way and they aren't clearly organized around topics.</p>	<p>Materials provide a sequence or series of texts that build knowledge and vocabulary systematically through reading, writing, listening, and speaking. These texts are organized around a variety of topics at each grade level.</p>
<p>Range and Quality of Texts (Group 1) *Complete texts vs. abridged</p> <p>Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p> <p>High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p>	<p>There is little to no evidence that the texts included in the instructional materials reflect the text, characteristics, and genres that are specifically required by the standards at each grade level.</p>	<p>Some of the texts included in the instructional materials reflect the text, characteristics, and genres that are specifically required by the standards at each grade level.</p>	<p>A large majority of texts included in the instructional materials reflect the text, characteristics, and genres that are specifically required by the standards at each grade level.</p>
	<p>There is little to no evidence that support materials for the anchor texts provide opportunities for students to engage in a range and volume of reading to achieve reading fluency of grade-level complex text.</p>	<p>There is some opportunity for students to engage in a range and volume of reading to achieve complex text as required by the Foundational Skills Standards.</p>	<p>Support materials for the anchor texts provide ample opportunity for students to engage in a range and volume of reading to achieve reading fluency of grade-level complex text as required by the Foundational Skills Standards.</p>
<p>Questions, Tasks, and Assignments (Group 2)</p> <p>Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p>	<p>There are little to no high-quality sequences of text-dependent questions prevalent in the materials that build a deep understanding of the knowledge and central ideas of the text.</p>	<p>Sequences of text-dependent questions are in the materials but don't always build a deep understanding of the knowledge and central ideas of the text.</p>	<p>High-quality sequences of text-dependent questions are prevalent in the materials and build a deep understanding of the knowledge and central ideas of the text.</p>
	<p>There is little to no evidence that the questions and tasks in the materials support students in understanding the academic</p>	<p>Some of the questions and tasks in the materials support students in understanding the academic language prevalent in complex</p>	<p>Questions and tasks in the materials support students in understanding the academic language prevalent in complex</p>

<p>High School Metric Score</p> <p>0 1 2 3</p>	language in complex texts.	texts.	texts.
	There is little to no evidence that materials focus on argument and informative writing or that they may reflect blended forms in similar proportions (e.g., exposition and persuasion).	There is some focus on argument and informative writing but some of the writing prompts do not serve a purpose.	Materials focus on argument and informative writing in the specified proportions. Alternatively, they may reflect blended forms in similar proportions (e.g., exposition and persuasion).
	There are little to no writing opportunities that are prominent and varied.	There are some writing opportunities but they are not prominent or varied and do not do enough to support students' developing writing skills over the course of the school year.	Materials support students' developing writing skills over the course of the school year. This includes writing opportunities that are prominent and varied.
	There is little to no evidence that materials integrate speaking and listening into lessons, questions, and tasks and build in frequent opportunities for collaborative discussions.	There is some integration of speaking and listening into lessons, questions, and tasks. Opportunities for collaborative discussions are not frequent.	Materials integrate speaking and listening into lessons, questions, and tasks and build in frequent opportunities for collaborative discussions.
	There is little to no evidence that materials include explicit instruction of the grammar and conventions standards for grade level as applied in increasingly sophisticated contexts, with opportunities for application both in and out of context.	There is some instruction (as well as opportunities for application both in and out of context) of the grammar and conventions standards for grade level.	Materials include explicit instruction of the grammar and conventions standards for grade level as applied in increasingly sophisticated contexts, with opportunities for application both in and out of context.
	There is little to no evidence that the instruction and diagnostic support in phonics, word recognition, and fluency will develop proficient readers.	The instruction and diagnostic support in phonics, word recognition, and fluency is present but not robust.	Materials address grade-level standards for foundational skills by providing instruction and diagnostic support in phonics, word recognition, and fluency through a research-based and transparent progression to develop proficient readers.

<p>Building Knowledge with Texts, Vocabulary, and Tasks (Group 2)</p> <p>Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p> <p>High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p>	<p>There is little to no evidence that materials regularly ask students to complete culminating tasks in which they demonstrate their knowledge of a topic.</p>	<p>There are some culminating tasks in which students demonstrate their knowledge of a topic.</p>	<p>Materials regularly ask students to complete culminating tasks in which they demonstrate their knowledge of a topic.</p>
	<p>There is little to no evidence that materials require students to engage in many short, focused research projects annually to develop students' knowledge in a range of areas and to enable students to develop the expertise needed to conduct research independently.</p>	<p>There are a few short, focused research projects that develop students' knowledge in a range of areas and to enable students to develop the expertise needed to conduct research independently.</p>	<p>Materials require students to engage in many short, focused research projects annually to develop students' knowledge in a range of areas and to enable students to develop the expertise needed to conduct research independently.</p>
	<p>There is little to no evidence that materials include a cohesive, year-long plan for students to interact with and build academic vocabulary and increasingly sophisticated syntax.</p>	<p>There is a plan for students to interact with and build academic vocabulary but it is not cohesive or robust.</p>	<p>Materials include a cohesive, year-long plan for students to interact with and build academic vocabulary and increasingly sophisticated syntax.</p>
<p>Access to Standards for All Students (Group 2)</p> <p>Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p> <p>High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p>	<p>Teachers and students can not reasonably complete the core content within a regular school year.</p>	<p>Teachers and students can complete most of the core content within a regular school year.</p>	<p>Teachers and students can reasonably complete the core content within a regular school year to maximize students' learning.</p>
	<p>There is little to no evidence that materials regularly provide all students, including those who read, write, speak, or listen below grade level, or whose first language is other than English, with extensive opportunities to work with and meet grade-level standards.</p>	<p>The materials provide some opportunities for students, including those who read, write, speak, or listen below grade level, or whose first language is other than English, to work with and meet grade-level standards.</p>	<p>Materials regularly provide all students, including those who read, write, speak, or listen below grade level, or whose first language is other than English, with extensive opportunities to work with and meet grade-level standards.</p>
	<p>There is little to no evidence that</p>	<p>There are some extensions and/or</p>	<p>Materials regularly include</p>

	materials regularly include extensions and/or more advanced opportunities for students who read, write, speak, or listen above grade level.	advanced opportunities for students who read, write, speak, or listen above grade level.	extensions and/or more advanced opportunities for students who read, write, speak, or listen above grade level.
	There is little to no evidence that materials regularly and systematically build in the time, resources, and suggestions required for adapting instruction to allow teachers to guide all students to meet grade-level standards.	There are some resources and time built in to adapt instruction to allow teachers to guide all students to meet grade-level standards.	Materials regularly and systematically build in the time, resources, and suggestions required for adapting instruction to allow teachers to guide all students to meet grade-level standards (e.g., alternative teaching approaches, pacing, instructional delivery options, suggestions for addressing common student difficulties, remediation strategies).
	There is little to no evidence that materials regularly and systematically offer assessment opportunities that genuinely measure progress on reading comprehension and writing proficiency as well as on mastery of grade level standards.	The materials offer some assessment opportunities that measure progress on reading comprehension and writing proficiency as well as on mastery of grade level standards.	Materials regularly and systematically offer assessment opportunities that measure progress on reading comprehension and writing proficiency as well as on mastery of grade level standards. This progress includes gradual release of supporting scaffolds for students to measure their independent abilities.
	There are no or very few opportunities for formative assessment.	Materials include some formative assessments which identify areas of need and inform instruction.	Materials include formative assessments which identify areas of need and inform instruction.
Cultural Representation in Texts & Curriculum	There is little to no evidence that texts included in the instructional materials are culturally responsive and relevant, and represent	The majority of the texts included in the instructional materials are not culturally responsive and relevant, nor do they represent	Texts included in the instructional materials are culturally responsive and relevant, and represent authentic voices.

(Group 3) Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3 High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3	authentic voices.	authentic voices.	
	There is little to no evidence that materials promote equitable instruction by providing guidance for teachers to support learning activities that are culturally responsive/relevant.	There is some promotion of equitable instruction by providing guidance for teachers to support learning activities that are culturally responsive/relevant.	Materials promote equitable instruction by providing guidance for teachers to support learning activities that are culturally responsive/relevant.
Accessibility/Usability (Group 3)	Materials are not easy to implement and technology is not easily accessible to teachers and students.	Materials are somewhat easy to implement and accessibility is spotty.	Materials are feasible to implement, and where technology is used, it is accessible to teachers and all students.
Culturally & Linguistically Responsive (Group 3) Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3 High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3	Few or no materials reflect diverse cultures, languages, or student experiences.	Some materials reflect cultural and linguistic diversity, but representation is inconsistent.	Materials consistently reflect diverse cultures, languages, and student experiences.
	Multilingual learners lack support through authentic texts or translations.	Limited authentic texts or translations are available for multilingual learners.	Authentic texts and translations for multilingual learners are integrated throughout.
	Student voice and belonging are minimally addressed.	Student voice and belonging are occasionally addressed but not emphasized.	Student voice, belonging, and agency are celebrated and prioritized.
Differentiation (Group 3) Middle School Metric Score	Few scaffolds or supports are provided for diverse learners (multilingual, neurodiverse, TAG).	Some scaffolds or supports exist but are not comprehensive or consistent.	Scaffolds and supports are robust and consistently address the needs of diverse learners.
	Minimal resources are available for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.	Resources for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions are limited or not fully integrated.	Comprehensive Tier 2 and Tier 3 resources are embedded or included.

0 1 2 3 High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3	Differentiation is rarely evident across the curriculum.	Differentiation is present in some areas but lacks breadth and depth.	Materials demonstrate clear differentiation for all levels of learners.
Comprehensive Literacy Integration (Group 4) Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3 High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3	Few opportunities for daily reading, writing, speaking, and listening activities.	Some opportunities exist for daily literacy activities, but they are inconsistently applied.	Daily opportunities for reading, writing, speaking, and listening are embedded.
	Texts and writing prompts do not span multiple genres or are limited in variety.	Texts and prompts span some genres but lack variety or depth.	Texts and prompts span multiple genres and support rich exploration of literacy.
	Vocabulary instruction is minimal or disconnected from content.	Vocabulary instruction is present but not systematically tied to content.	Vocabulary instruction is explicit, systematic, and tied to content.
Teacher Usability & Alignment (Group 4) Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3 High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3	Scope and sequence are unclear or difficult to navigate.	Scope and sequence are present but may be inconsistent or difficult to use.	Scope and sequence are clear, user-friendly, and accessible for teachers.
	Materials lack alignment with ELP standards or integrated services.	Some alignment with ELP standards or integrated services is evident but incomplete.	Materials align fully with ELP standards and integrated services.
	Rubrics, exemplars, and tools for progress monitoring are absent.	Limited rubrics, exemplars, and progress-monitoring tools are included.	Rubrics, exemplars, and tools for progress monitoring are comprehensive and robust.
Engagement & Rigor	Few or no materials address	Some materials include relevant	Materials consistently engage

(Group 4) Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3 High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3	relevant, real-world topics or applications.	topics or real-world applications but lack consistency.	students with relevant, real-world topics and applications.
	Critical thinking and research skills are minimally developed.	Critical thinking and research skills are addressed sporadically.	Critical thinking, research skills, and writing rigor are systematically developed.
	Culminating tasks are absent or fail to integrate literacy skills.	Culminating tasks exist but are not well-integrated with literacy skills.	Culminating tasks integrate literacy skills and provide meaningful, authentic learning experiences.

Classroom Libraries (Group 4)	Classroom libraries are absent or contain few diverse, high-interest materials.	Classroom libraries include some diverse or high-interest materials, but selection is limited.	Classroom libraries are rich in diverse, high-interest materials that reflect student needs.
	Reading materials do not span multiple levels or topics.	Reading materials span some levels and topics but lack consistency.	Reading materials span multiple levels, interests, and topics to engage all students.

Additional Considerations for DL Representatives 

Authenticity in the Teaching and Learning of the Program Languages (Group 5) Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3 High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3	There is little to no evidence that each program language characteristics are respected in the methods recommended for teaching and learning them. For example, Spanish text and instruction is not authentic.	There is some evidence that each program language characteristics are respected in the methods recommended for teaching and learning them. For example, some Spanish text is authentic or high-quality translation, and instruction is sometimes authentic.	Each program language characteristics are respected in the methods recommended for teaching and learning them. For example, Spanish text and instruction is authentic. Texts are not translations and instruction is not adapted to how we teach English.
	There is little to no evidence that the curriculum includes guidance in how to teach structures that are unique to each program language. For example, there is guidance in how to teach acentos en español.	There is some guidance in how to teach structures that are unique to each program language.	The curriculum includes guidance in how to teach structures that are unique to each program language. For example, there is guidance in how to teach acentos en español.

<p>Metalinguistic connections (oral and written) (Group 5)</p> <p>Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p> <p>High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p>	<p>There is little to no evidence that the materials offer explicit opportunities for cross-linguistic connections. For example, bridge levels 1 and 2 tasks and moments.</p>	<p>There is some opportunity for cross-linguistic connections. For example, bridge levels 1 and 2 tasks and moments.</p>	<p>Materials offer explicit opportunities for cross-linguistic connections. For example, bridge levels 1 and 2 tasks and moments.</p>
<p>Aligned to Updated Research about Dual Language/Bilingual Education (Group 5)</p> <p>Middle School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p> <p>High School Metric Score 0 1 2 3</p>	<p>There is little to no evidence that guidance for Dual Language implementation promotes constant and strategic connections between program languages, rather than a strict separation of languages.</p>	<p>There is some evidence that guidance for Dual Language implementation promotes constant and strategic connections between program languages, rather than a strict separation of languages.</p>	<p>Guidance for Dual Language implementation promotes constant and strategic connections between program languages, rather than a strict separation of languages.</p> <p>*Please take all the components of the C6 Biliteracy Instructional Framework as a reference.</p> <p>Note: It is probable that not all the components of the C6 are explicitly mentioned in the materials, but, at least, it is important that the curriculum does not contradict this framework since it represents updated research in Dual Language education.</p>
<p>Besides these three additional considerations for the Dual Language Program, it will be crucial to pay special attention to the culturally and linguistically responsive/sustaining and representation of authentic voices criteria. All these criteria support students in their growth in the areas of multilingualism/multiliteracy and sociocultural competency.</p>			

Resources:

[Oregon's Adolescent Literacy Framework \(DRAFT\)](#)

ODE IMET [Middle School](#), [High School](#)

[Culturally Responsive English Language Arts Curriculum Scorecard](#)

[C6 Biliteracy Instructional Framework](#)