Alabama State Textbook Adoption Process

for

Career and Technical Education

(Architecture and Construction, Information Technology, Transportation, Distribution, and Logistics)

Robert (Tripp) Marshall, Career and Technical Education Chairperson
Carolyn Jones, Alabama State Textbook Administrator
State Textbook Committee Composition
§16-36-60 (b)

23 Members

14 Members
4 Elementary Teachers
4 Secondary Teachers
4 State at Large
2 Higher Education

9 Members
Governor’s Appointees
State Textbook Committee Members Career and Technical Education

- Andrew Large Secondary Mobile County District I
- Seth Stehouwer Elementary Chambers County District II
- Spencer Stone Secondary Alabaster City District III
- Nyssa Haley Elementary Pickens County District IV
- Scott Graham Secondary Montgomery County District V
- Michelle Funderburg Secondary Gadsden City District VI
- April Terrell Elementary Marion County District VII
- Robert Slack III Elementary Huntsville City District VIII
- Linda Thomas Teacher Chambers County State-at-large
- Amy Dyer Administrator Dekalb County State-at-large
- James Morse Administrator Huntsville City State-at-large
- Shawn McDaniel Administrator Pickens County State-at-large
- Lee Anne Pessoney Lecturer University AL Huntsville Post Secondary
- Vacant Professor University Post Secondary
Additional State Textbook Committee Members for Career and Technical Education

- Thomas Archer Secondary Huntsville City District VIII
- Steven Icenogle Secondary Enterprise City District II
- Robert Marshall Secondary Tuscaloosa County District IV
- Monroe McCullough Secondary Houston County District II
- Pamela Paquette Secondary Madison City District VIII
- Richard Richardson Secondary Montgomery Co. District V
- Joshua Richter Secondary Enterprise City District II
- Kevin Burnside Workforce Huntsville City District VIII
State Textbook Committee Members Career and Technical Education Governor’s Appointees

- Harolyn Benjamin, District I
- Shane Cobb, District II
- Sherry DeLoach, District VII
- Nancy Dickson, District VI
- Eric Fulmer, District VIII
- Lance Hunter, District III
- Cathy Madison, District V
- Paul Morin, District IV
- Brian Naugher, At-Large Local School Board Member
Steps In the State Textbook Adoption Process

- Revision of the Career and Technical Education (CTE) Courses of Study.
- Publishers are sent a request for bids (RFB) for CTE.
- Nominations are requested for the State Textbook Committee.
- Appointment of State Textbook Committees.
- Textbooks and supplemental materials are reviewed.
- Public input solicited (during & after reviews).
- Committee recommendations to State Board for approval or rejection.
Publishing Companies Completing the Bid Process for Career and Technical Education Textbooks and Supplemental Resources

- Cengage Learning, Inc.
- CompuScholar
- eDynamic Learning
- Goodheart-Wilcox Company
Official Bid Categories for Publishers Defined

For Career and Technical Education (CTE), a comprehensive textbook/program is defined as one that meets the standards outlined in the 2022 Alabama Courses of Study for Architecture and Construction, Information Technology, and Transportation, Distribution, & Logistics.

For CTE, a supplemental textbook/program is used to support and extend the critical elements of a comprehensive textbook/program. A supplementary textbook/program is not sufficient to be used as the primary resource for a particular grade or course.
## Career and Technical Education
### Overall Textbooks/ Supplemental Materials Rating Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier I, Exemplifies Quality</th>
<th>90% - 100%</th>
<th>Recommended for Board Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier II, Approaching Quality</td>
<td>80% - 89%</td>
<td>Recommended for Board Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier III, Not Representing Quality</td>
<td>79% and Below</td>
<td>Recommended for Board Rejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for Review

- Review and document all evidence before deciding on ratings.
- Consider quantity as well as quality of evidence for each indicator.
- Consider evidence of high quality as well as evidence of low quality.
- Do not feel compelled to weight each indicator and criterion equally.
- Do not consider provided examples to be exhaustive or restrictive.
- If evidence is lacking for an indicator, flag it for further data collection.
Sources of Evidence

- The product itself: unit and lesson plans, teacher guides, student resources, associated software, and other components.

- Other credible and comprehensive reviews of materials, such as those by EdReports and the Louisiana Department of Education.

- Perceptual data, such as survey responses and focus group findings, from educators with experience using the product in schools.

- Information—such as product specifications and videos of teachers using the product—provided by its developers or publishers.

- Research findings that demonstrate that the materials have a positive impact on student learning.
Definitions of Ratings

4--Exceeds Expectations:
All materials reviewed indicate high-quality; none indicate low quality.

3--Meets Expectations:
Most or all evidence indicates high quality; little to none indicates low quality. Materials may not be perfect, but Alabama educators and students would be well served and strongly supported by them.

2--Partially Meets Expectations:
Some evidence indicates high quality, while some indicates low quality. Alabama educators would benefit from having these materials but need to supplement or adapt them substantively to serve their students well.

1--Does Not Meet Expectations:
Little to no evidence indicates high quality; most or all evidence indicates low quality. Materials would not substantively help Alabama educators and students meet the state’s expectations for teaching and learning.

IE--Insufficient Evidence:
More evidence is needed before a rating can be justified. If you are unsure about a rating because you lack relevant information, be sure to choose this option instead of “defaulting” to a rating of Partially Meets Expectations.
# Review Form Cover Sheet for CTE

**Alabama State Department of Education**  
**High-Quality Instructional Materials Review Form**  
**Career and Technical Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Grade-Level(s)/Course:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publisher:</td>
<td>Copyright:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating (Choose one):**

- Tier I, Exemplifies Quality 90% - 100%
- Tier II, Approaching Quality 80% - 89%
- Tier III, Not representing Quality 79% and below

Reviewed by: ___________________________  
Date: ___________________________
Textbook Committee Members
Review Criteria

**Guidelines for Review**

- Review and document all evidence before deciding on ratings.
- Consider quantity as well as quality of evidence for each indicator.
- Consider evidence of high quality as well as evidence of low quality.
- Do not feel compelled to weight each indicator and criterion equally.
- Do not consider provided examples to be exhaustive or restrictive.
- If evidence is lacking for an indicator, flag it for further data collection.

**Sources of Evidence**

- The product itself, unit and lesson plans, teacher guides, student-facing resources, associated software, and other components
- Other credible and comprehensive reviews of materials, such as those by EdReports and the Louisiana Department of Education
- Perceptual data, such as survey responses and focus group findings, from educators with experience using the product in schools
- Information—such as product specifications and videos of teachers using the product—provided by its developers or publishers
- Research findings that demonstrate that the materials have a positive impact on student learning

**Definitions of Ratings**

4—Exceeds Expectations:
All materials reviewed indicate high quality; none indicate low quality.

3—Meets Expectations:
Most or all evidence indicates high quality; little to none indicates low quality. Materials may not be perfect, but Alabama educators and students would be well served and strongly supported by them.

2—Partially Meets Expectations:
Some evidence indicates high quality, while some indicates low quality. Alabama educators would benefit from having these materials but need to supplement or adapt them substantively to serve their students well.

1—Does Not Meet Expectations:
Little to no evidence indicates high quality; most or all evidence indicates low quality. Materials would not substantively help Alabama educators and students meet the state's expectations for teaching and learning.

IE—Insufficient Evidence:
More evidence is needed before a rating can be justified. If you are unsure about a rating because you lack relevant information, be sure to choose this option instead of “defaulting” to a rating of Partially Meets Expectations.
Components of the Textbook Review Form

Section One: Non-negotiables

Section Two: Alignment to Alabama Course of Study Standards

Section Three: Classroom Application

Section Four: Additional Criteria of Superior Quality

Final Evaluation
# Career and Technical Education Review Form Components

## SECTION 1: NON-NEGOTIABLES

Publishers must comply with all indicators below for participation in the review process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Material(s) are aligned to Alabama Course of Study:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Material(s) are available for review online or in a digital format, when applicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Username(s) and password(s) are created and active for online access by reviewers and public throughout the entire state and local review process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION 2: ALIGNMENT TO ALABAMA COURSE OF STUDY STANDARDS

|   | Number of Standards | Number of Standards Met | Percentage of Standards Met |

*Note: The scoring rubric for specific subject area Courses of Study Standards will be an addendum for scoring purposes. Reviewers will use the results from the rubric to complete the information above. The percentage of standards met will be determined by dividing the number of standards met by the number of standards for the subject area.*
### SECTION 3: CLASSROOM APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Points Obtained</th>
<th>Percentage of Points Obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Directions for reviewers using this rubric:**

Indicate your findings based on the extent to which the criteria were met using 1-4 rating scale. Ratings are equivalent in point value. To determine the percentage of indicators met, divide total points obtained by 220 possible points.

4—Exceeds Expectations: All materials reviewed indicate high-quality; none indicate low-quality.

3—Meets Expectations: Most or all evidence indicates high-quality; little to none indicates low-quality. Materials may not be perfect, but Alabama educators and students would be well served and strongly supported by them.

2—Partially Meets Expectations: Some evidence indicates high-quality, while some indicates low-quality. Alabama educators would benefit from having these materials but need to supplement or adapt them substantively to serve their students well.

1—Does Not Meet Expectations: Little to no evidence indicates high-quality; most or all evidence indicates low-quality. Materials would not substantively help Alabama educators and students meet the state’s expectations for teaching and learning.

IE—Insufficient Evidence: More evidence is needed before a rating can be justified. If you are unsure about a rating because you lack relevant information, be sure to choose this option instead of “defaulting” to a rating of Partially Meets Expectations.

#### Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment with Curriculum</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The content aligns with the standards for grade level and expected learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The content is written to the correct skill level of the standards in the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The materials are adaptable and useful for classroom instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Level of Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The level of complexity is appropriate for instruction of the standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The content is developmentally appropriate for the age of the students, student ability and level of language acquisition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL CRITERIA OF SUPERIOR QUALITY (may not apply for all subject areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>108 Possible Points</th>
<th></th>
<th>Points Obtained</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of Points Obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Directions for reviewers using this rubric:**
Indicate your findings based on the extent to which the criteria were met using 1-4 rating scale. Ratings are equivalent in point value. To determine the percentage of indicators met, divide total points obtained by 108 possible points.

4—Exceeds Expectations: All materials reviewed indicate high quality; none indicate low quality.

3—Meets Expectations: Most or all evidence indicates high quality; little to none indicates low quality. Materials may not be perfect, but Alabama educators and students would be well served and strongly supported by them.

2—Partially Meets Expectations: Some evidence indicates high quality, while some indicates low quality. Alabama educators would benefit from having these materials but need to supplement or adapt them substantively to serve their students well.

1—Does Not Meet Expectations: Little to no evidence indicates high quality; most or all evidence indicates low quality. Materials would not substantively help Alabama educators and students meet the state’s expectations for teaching and learning.

IE—Insufficient Evidence: More evidence is needed before a rating can be justified. If you are unsure about a rating because you lack relevant information, be sure to choose this option instead of “defaulting” to a rating of Partially Meets Expectations.

## Career and Technical Education / Workforce Development Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The text and/or material fosters an integrated approach where concepts and skills are taught in tandem.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The content incorporates and supports current performance and research-based practices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The text and/or material effectively integrates a wide variety of CTE/WFD techniques and genres.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Activities include guiding questions which encourage the development of higher-level thinking and performance skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Activities include project-based learning opportunities relevant to the content standards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FINAL EVALUATION**

Compile the results for Sections 2-4 to make a final recommendation for the instructional material(s) under review. To determine the total for the material scored, the reviewer will add the results of the sections and divide by 3. If there are no scores for Section 4, then the reviewer will divide the results by 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 1: NON-NEGOTIABLES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 2: ALIGNMENT TO ALABAMA COURSE OF STUDY STANDARDS</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 3: CLASSROOM APPLICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL CRITERIA OF SUPERIOR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL

**FINAL RECOMMENDATION FOR THE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL(S):**

Choose one:
Tier I, Exemplifies Quality 90% - 100%
Tier II, Approaching Quality 80% - 89%
Tier III, Not representing Quality 79% and below

Comments:
The Textbook Adoption Review Process

- Textbook Committee Organizational Meeting *(June 22, 2022)*
  - Oath of Office
  - State Textbook Law Overview
  - Duties of State Textbook Committee
  - Career and Technical Education Courses of Study Overview
  - Textbook Committee Organization
    - Chairperson
    - Secretary
    - Sub-Committee Assignments
- Publishers Presentations for CTE *(July 5, 2022)*
The Textbook Adoption Review Process continued......

- Official Committee Review Sessions (July 19-21, 2022)
- Official Committee Review Sessions (August 3-4, 2022)
- Official Committee Review Sessions (August 23-25, 2022)
- Official Final Committee Review Session (September 13-15, 2022)
- 30 – Day Public Input Period for Committee Begins (August 12, 2022)
  - Public Notice Press Release Advertised & Also Shared with Alabama PTA
- Public Input Period for Committee Ends (September 12, 2022)
- State Board Receives Textbook Recommendations (December 8, 2022)
- Career and Technical Education Chairperson Present Textbook Adoption Process Overview (December 8, 2022)
- Public Examination Period Begins for Career and Technical Education Textbooks and Materials (December 8, 2022)
  - Press Release
- Public Input and Official Textbook Adoption (January 12, 2023)
Sample Textbook Materials Review Results

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION TEXTBOOKS AND SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS REVIEW

2022-2023

(Architecture and Construction, Information Technology, Transportation, Distribution and Logistics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier I, Exemplifies Quality</th>
<th>90% - 100%</th>
<th>Approved by AL State Board of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier II, Approaching Quality</td>
<td>80% - 89%</td>
<td>Approved by AL State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier III, Not Representing Quality</td>
<td>79% and Below</td>
<td>Rejected by AL State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level/Subject Area</th>
<th>Textbook Title/Series</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Average Reviewer Score</th>
<th>Supplemental or Comprehensive</th>
<th>Textbook Committee Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Construction</td>
<td>Construction Academy Basic Principles</td>
<td>Jones Learning, LLC</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>No Comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding Basics</td>
<td>Stevens Publishing</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>No Comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions or Comments!