



**Snohomish School District
Curriculum & Instruction**

Request for Curricular Materials Selection

Directions: This form is to be filled out by the task force chair and submitted as the cover page to the packet containing all teacher, student and parent evaluation forms. This form serves as a summary and recommendation to the Curriculum Materials Committee. Send this form and a copy of the proposed instructional material to Teaching and Learning Services at least two weeks prior to the date of the presentation to the Curriculum Materials Committee. Please send a copy of the proposed material for parents/community members to peruse. Thank you.

Task Force or Source of the Request: _____

Task Force Chair or Principal: _____

Description of Curricular Material:

Title: _____

Author(s): _____

Publisher: _____ Publication Date: _____

Grade level and content/course for which the proposed material is being considered:

Rationale for Proposing Curricular Material: Describe where and how this proposed material will be incorporated and used in the adopted curriculum (relevance to essential learnings, outcomes, enrichment, remediation, etc.) _____

Other Curricular Materials Reviewed and Evaluated: (Please list title, author(s), publisher, copyright date, and reason for rejection.) _____

Task Force Chair: _____ Date: _____

(Attach other pages as needed.)

**Snohomish School District
Evaluation of Instructional Materials**

School _____ Teacher _____ Grade _____

Name of Book/Publisher _____

Statement		Choose One		
1.	I enjoyed the lessons and activities.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
2.	The texts, videos, or hands-on activities helped me learn.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
3.	The materials made me curious, and I want to learn more.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
4.	I can apply my learning to real life or the world around me.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
5.	I feel more confident in the subject than before.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
6.	The technology materials are interesting and helpful.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral

Comments: _____

Submit to _____
Task Force Chair

By _____
Date

**Snohomish School District
Evaluation of Instructional Materials
Parent Evaluation**

School _____ Teacher _____ Grade _____

Name of Book/Publisher _____

Statement		Choose One		
1.	The format of the materials is well-organized, and the information is clearly presented.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
2.	The content is accurate and current.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
3.	The materials represent our diverse community.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
4.	My child talks about activities, lessons, and/or learning from the new materials at home.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
5.	My child can connect topics in class to real life.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
6.	My child's confidence in the subject area has increased.	Agree	Disagree	Neutral

Comments:

Submit to _____
Task Force Chair or Child's teacher

By _____
Date

Evaluation of Instructional Materials Teacher Evaluation

This form is intended to be filled out by teachers who will be expected to teach using the recommended instructional materials. The following criteria are to be used for all basic and supplemental curricular materials. Please circle a rating for each dimension listed below which best describes the curricular material:

Content, Quality, and Alignment

Analytic Dimension	Adjectives	Rating
1. Alignment to Washington State Learning Standards (e.g., ELA, Math, Science)	Fully aligned ... Not aligned	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2. Vertical coherence and grade-level progression	Coherent ... Fragmented	5 4 3 2 1 NA
3. Accuracy of disciplinary content	Accurate ... Inaccurate	5 4 3 2 1 NA

Instructional Design and Learning Supports

(OSPI Focus: MTSS, scaffolding, instructional coherence)

Analytic Dimension	Adjectives	Rating
4. Logical sequencing and scaffolding	Well-sequenced ... Disorganized	5 4 3 2 1 NA
5. Student-centered instructional practices (inquiry, discourse, collaboration)	Student-centered ... Teacher-directed	5 4 3 2 1 NA
6. Teacher guidance and instructional supports	Robust ... Minimal	5 4 3 2 1 NA
7. Supports for diverse learners (MTSS tiers, multilingual learners, special education)	Comprehensive ... Limited	5 4 3 2 1 NA
8. Accessibility and readability for grade level	Appropriate ... Inappropriate	5 4 3 2 1 NA
9. Flexible pacing and scheduling models	Flexible ... Rigid	5 4 3 2 1 NA
10. Student motivation and relevance to real-world contexts	Highly motivating ... Not motivating	5 4 3 2 1 NA
11. Classroom routines and management support	Helpful ... Not helpful	5 4 3 2 1 NA
12. Alignment with district instructional frameworks*	Compatible ... Incompatible	5 4 3 2 1 NA
13. Teacher usability and clarity of materials	Clear ... Confusing	5 4 3 2 1 NA
14. Assessment system (formative, summative, progress monitoring)	Comprehensive ... Insufficient	5 4 3 2 1 NA

Equity, Culturally Responsive & Anti-Bias Criteria

(Aligned to WA HB 1905, OSPI Culturally Responsive Education Framework)

Analytic Dimension	Adjectives	Rating
15. Multiple perspectives on complex or controversial topics	Balanced ... One-sided	5 4 3 2 1 NA
16. Supports culturally responsive pedagogy (community connections, identity, voice)	Strong ... Weak	5 4 3 2 1 NA
17. Asset-based framing of diversity	Asset-based ... Deficit-based	5 4 3 2 1 NA
18. Includes representation and contributions of historically marginalized groups	Extensive ... Absent	5 4 3 2 1 NA
19. Promotes belonging, identity development, and student agency	Strong ... Minimal	5 4 3 2 1 NA

Teacher's Signature

Date

Submit to _____
Task Force Chair

By _____
Date

Evaluation of Instructional Materials Teaching and Learning Evaluation

This form is intended to be filled out by the task force chair. Please circle a rating for each dimension listed below which best describes the curricular material:

Implementation, Cost, and Sustainability

Analytic Dimension	Adjectives	Rating
1. Program coherence and clarity of scope and sequence	Clear ... Unclear	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2. Author/developer expertise	Expert ... Unqualified	5 4 3 2 1 NA
3. Publisher/vendor reliability and long-term support	Reliable ... Unreliable	5 4 3 2 1 NA
4. Recency of materials and update cycle	Current ... Outdated	5 4 3 2 1 NA
5. Total cost of ownership (materials, licenses, PD, replacements)	Cost-effective ... Cost-prohibitive	5 4 3 2 1 NA
6. Procurement and licensing flexibility	Flexible ... Restrictive	5 4 3 2 1 NA
7. Availability and supply chain reliability	Readily available ... Limited	5 4 3 2 1 NA
8. Resource and infrastructure requirements	Minimal ... Extensive	5 4 3 2 1 NA
9. Professional learning and implementation support	Robust ... Minimal	5 4 3 2 1 NA
10. Alignment with district MTSS/intervention systems	Aligned ... Not aligned	5 4 3 2 1 NA
11. Scalability and sustainability across schools and years	Sustainable ... Unsustainable	5 4 3 2 1 NA

Accessibility, Technology, and Physical/Digital Quality (OSPI Digital Learning & Accessibility Guidance, FERPA/COPPA considerations)

Analytic Dimension	Adjectives	Rating
12. Quality of visuals, media, and instructional design	High quality ... Low quality	5 4 3 2 1 NA
13. User interface and design	Intuitive ... Cluttered	5 4 3 2 1 NA
14. Completeness of instructional components	Comprehensive ... Limited	5 4 3 2 1 NA

Analytic Dimension	Adjectives	Rating
15. Consumable and replacement needs	Manageable ... Excessive	5 4 3 2 1 NA
16. Durability of physical materials	Durable ... Fragile	5 4 3 2 1 NA
17. Overall production quality	High ... Low	5 4 3 2 1 NA
18. Technology integration and digital tools	Effective ... Ineffective	5 4 3 2 1 NA
19. Accessibility (UDL, WCAG 2.1, captions, multilingual, screen reader compatibility)	Fully accessible ... Inaccessible	5 4 3 2 1 NA
20. Student data privacy and security (FERPA, COPPA, WA state requirements)	Strong protections ... Weak protections	5 4 3 2 1 NA
21. Analytics and reporting for teachers and administrators	Robust ... Minimal	5 4 3 2 1 NA

Task Force Chair Signature

Date