

2020F3

Instructional Materials Committee CURRICULUM ADOPTION REQUEST

Text/Resource Requestor: Elizabeth Talvitie

School: WHS

Subject: Biology

Department/Grade: Science

Intended Use: 10th grade

Number of Copies Needed: 120

Text/Resource Title: Miller Levine Biology

Author: Kenneth R. Miller and Joseph S. Levine

Publisher: Pearson

Copyright Date:2016

I have taken the following steps to determine the suitability of the above text:

(x) 1. I have read it and found that it meets the criteria of the district Instructional Materials Committee, including Criteria for the elimination of sex bias. This is a mandatory step.

(x) 2. I have compared it with these other available texts:

(x) 3. I have compared review of it with review of these other available texts: Holt Biology, McGraw-Hill Biology, BSCS Biology

(x) 4. I have evaluated the reading level and found it averages about grade.

(x) 5. I have used the text on a trial basis for about 6 weeks, per district policy and the Curriculum director's approval.

() 6. Other

Approval Dates

Text Selector Signature : *Elizabeth M Talvitie*

Approval Date: *5-25-17*

Principal Signature: *J. L. Sharp*

Approval Date: *5/25/17*

Assistant Superintendent Signature:

Instructional Material Committee

Approval Date:

Board of Directors

Approval Date:

Evaluation Reading Level (CCSS Qualitative and Quantitative Measures):

1. Qualitative evaluation of the text:

Looked over the layout- very student friendly. Pictures match the text, which is chronologically laid out in an order that matches our curriculum and NGSS standards.

2. Quantitative evaluation of the text:

We used some matrixes to evaluate text- one from OSPI and CSS Quality Criteria Checklist and the other from Wisconsin (as WA state does not have a specific rubric for text adoption yet). Through both rubric, the text exceeded standards for the grade level. We also looked at other sources that have evaluated the text such as the Lexile measures and Pearson Publishing's own rating.

3. Matching reader to text and task:

Students need to read the text in order to answer end of section questions and/or to analyze a problem. The text is a useful resource to supplement student in class notes/lecture providing enriching and engaging illustrations and graphics.

Selection Process

1. Will this material be the basic text or will it supplement the basic text? If it is supplementary, what is your basic text?

This will be the basic text

2. What process did you use to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of this text/resource?

We looked at a variety of available text books, researched how the book matched with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), access to text for students (is it at grade level- is there support for ELL students), and overall layout and usability of book as aligned with our curriculum.

3. What other set materials of instructional did you materials consider?

We looked at the on-line text, supplemental videos, student workbooks and lab books, teacher curriculum guides.

4. In what ways is this material better than the other materials? (Text format, organization content, unbiased content concerning minorities and women, teacher's guide, workbooks, etc.)

The book has a very user friendly format, provides solid illustrations to emphasize the material. Includes

good real world applications of the concepts after each unit and all units are NGSS aligned.

5. How does this material fit the learning objectives for the subject area?

All units are NGSS aligned and include STEM activities and extensions.

6. How Does this material insure continuity with the district's overall program?

The district is headed toward more STEM content and alignment of all Science programs with NGSS.

Instructional Materials Committee Evaluation Form cont.

Bias Content: Please circle a rating for each answer.

1. Presents more than one view point of controversial issues.
 Excellent Good Fair Poor Non-App.
 2. Presents Minorities realistically.
Excellent Good Fair Poor Non-App.
 3. Includes contributions of minority authors.
Excellent Good Fair Poor Non-App.
 4. Presents non-stereotypic models
 Excellent Good Fair Poor Non-App.
 5. Facilitates the sharing of cultural differences.
Excellent Good Fair Poor Non-App.
 6. Promotes the positive nature of differences
 Excellent Good Fair Poor Non-App.
 7. Includes the contributions, inventions, or discoveries of minorities.
Excellent Good Fair Poor Non-App.
 8. Includes the contributions, inventions, or discoveries of women.
 Excellent Good Fair Poor Non-App.
 9. Presents minorities in a manner that promotes ethnic pride.
 Excellent Good Fair Poor Non-App.
 10. Facilitates an environment open to discovery and experimentation
 Excellent Good Fair Poor Non-App.
-