

District Reflection Tool: Special Populations

Supporting Instructional Materials Adoption & Implementation



District Reflection Tool: Special Populations

Supporting Instructional Materials Adoption & Implementation

Part	Title	Description	Purpose	Page
	Purpose of this Tool	Explains the intent, scope, and use of the District Reflection Tool within the instructional materials review and adoption process	Establish a shared understanding of how the tool supports subgroup-centered reflection, planning, and decision-making	2
	Participants	Identifies recommended stakeholders and team members involved in the reflection and decision-making process; can be used in conjunction with the Committee Composition Planning Tool	Ensure multiple perspectives and subgroup expertise are represented throughout the review process	2
	Guiding Principles	Defines the core beliefs and considerations that should guide district reflection, discussion, and decision-making	Promote evidence-based systems-oriented analysis focused on consistent student access and implementation	2
PART A	Grounding in Subgroup Evidence	Synthesizes data and findings related to subgroup performance and access	Establish evidence base for reflection	3
PART B	Domain-Level Reflection	Examines strengths and gaps across each subgroup domain using Criteria Bank results	Identify domain-specific opportunities and risks	4
PART C	Cross-Domain Analysis	Analyzes patterns and trends across domains and student groups	Surface system-level strengths and gaps	7
PART D	Alignment to Instructional Vision	Compares current practices and findings to district instructional vision	Ensure coherence between vision, materials, and practice	8
PART E	Implications for Instructional Materials	Identifies required features and risks in instructional materials based on findings	Define non-negotiables for materials adoption	9
PART F	Implementation Readiness & Conditions	Identifies staffing, systems, and supports required for successful implementation	Determine readiness and capacity needs	10
PART G	Decision Guidance	Supports final decision-making regarding adoption of instructional materials	Translate findings into actionable decisions	11
PART H	Next Steps	Outlines actions, ownership, and timelines for implementation	Move from decision to execution	12

PURPOSE OF THIS TOOL

This tool supports district leadership teams in examining subgroup access within their local context to inform instructional materials adoptions and implementation decisions and planning.

This process builds directly on the District Instructional Vision Refinement Tool and is intended to support districts in aligning instructional materials decisions with their articulated vision for teaching and learning.

The goal is to identify strengths, gaps, and areas for alignment to ensure that high-quality instructional materials (HQIMs) lead to consistent, coherent classroom instruction and improved student outcomes.

The tool is designed to:

- ▶ analyze findings from the Subgroup Criteria Bank
- ▶ identify opportunity gaps across student groups
- ▶ surface system-level strengths and risks
- ▶ determine implementation conditions required for success
- ▶ align directly to the school or district's instructional vision

This reflection process builds on the district's instructional vision and supports alignment between vision, materials, and practice.

PARTICIPANTS

This tool should be used collaboratively by district and school leaders to guide discussion, planning, and decision-making.

Cross-functional teams can be formed using the **Committee Composition Planning Template**.

Teams may include representation from:

- | | |
|--|--|
| ▶ Curriculum & Instruction Leadership | ▶ English Language Learner (ELL) Specialists |
| ▶ School-Based Administrators | ▶ Instructional Coaches |
| ▶ Classroom Teachers (General Education) | ▶ Intervention / MTSS Specialists |
| ▶ Content Area Specialists (ELA/Math/Science, etc.) | ▶ Assessment / Data Specialists |
| ▶ Exceptional Student Education (ESE) /
Special Education Representatives | ▶ Parents (Statutory Requirement) |
| | ▶ Community Members |

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

This tool is intended to be used in a facilitated group session with time for discussion, synthesis, and consensus-building. It is designed to facilitate discussion that will:

- ▶ Anchor all discussion in evidence from the **Subgroup Criteria Bank**
- ▶ Focus on system-level patterns
- ▶ Bring to the surface any differences across schools, classrooms, and student groups
- ▶ Prioritize clarity, coherence, and feasibility of different HQIMs

PART A: GROUNDING IN SUBGROUP EVIDENCE

Discussion Prompt:

What does our school or district data reveal about subgroup access to grade-level content?

Use Evidence From:

- ▶ Subgroup Criteria Bank results
- ▶ Student performance data on grade-level assessments (FAST, EOC, ACCESS, etc.)
- ▶ Progress monitoring data (MTSS / RTII)
- ▶ Learning walks / observations
- ▶ Student work samples

Area	Evidence/Notes
Consistent Strengths	
Consistent Gaps	
Most Impacted Student Groups	
Patterns Across Schools or Classrooms	

PART B: DOMAIN-LEVEL REFLECTION

Discussion Prompt:

For each domain, reflect using findings from the **Subgroup Criteria Bank**, including domain ratings, indicator-level evidence, and classification results: **Strong Embedded Supports** **Dependent on Local Capacity**

or **High Risk**

Domain 1: Access to Grade-Level Content

For each instructional material (HQIM) evaluated in Domain 1:

- ▶ Where are students consistently accessing grade-level content **Strong Embedded Supports** ?
- ▶ Where are students being redirected to below-grade-level work **High Risk** ?
- ▶ Which student groups are most impacted given the data analysis in **Part A**?

Implications for school or district practice (consider staffing, training, and system-level supports required):

Domain 2: Language Development (MLL/ELL Focus)

For each instructional material (HQIM) evaluated in Domain 2:

- ▶ Where and to what extent is language development embedded in content instruction **Strong Embedded Supports** ?
- ▶ Where are multilingual learners not fully supported **High Risk** ?

Implications for school or district practice (consider staffing, training, and system-level supports required):

Domain 3: Scaffolding & Differentiation

For each instructional material (HQIM) evaluated in Domain 3:

- ▶ Where do scaffolds effectively support access to rigorous content **Strong Embedded Supports** ?
- ▶ Where do supports rely heavily on teacher-created adaptations **High Risk** ?
- ▶ How are students with unfinished learning or interrupted education supported?

Implications for school or district practice (consider staffing, training, and system-level supports required):

Domain 4: Engagement & Discourse

For each instructional material (HQIM) evaluated in Domain 4:

- ▶ Where are students actively engaging in meaningful tasks and discourse **Strong Embedded Supports** ?
- ▶ Which students are not consistently participating in rigorous thinking **High Risk** ?

Implications for school or district practice (consider staffing, training, and system-level supports required):

Domain 5: Assessment & Feedback

For each instructional material (HQIM) evaluated in Domain 5:

- ▶ How effectively do assessment systems identify and respond to student needs
Strong Embedded Supports ?
- ▶ Where is feedback actionable and timely **Strong Embedded Supports** ?
- ▶ Where is embedded assessment successfully aligned to Florida state assessment systems
Strong Embedded Supports ?
- ▶ Where are gaps in progress monitoring or intervention alignment **High Risk** ?
- ▶ Where are there gaps or misalignment in the embedded assessments with Florida state assessment systems **High Risk** ?

Implications for school or district practice (consider staffing, training, and system-level supports required):

Domain 6: Accessibility & Usability (SWD Focus)

For each instructional material (HQIM) evaluated in Domain 6:

- ▶ Where are materials accessible and usable across classrooms **Strong Embedded Supports** ?
- ▶ Are accessible materials available at the same time as core instruction **Strong Embedded Supports** ?
- ▶ Where do accessibility supports depend on individual teachers or external systems **High Risk** ?

Implications for school or district practice (consider staffing, training, and system-level supports required):

PART C: CROSS-DOMAIN ANALYSIS

Discussion Prompt:

What patterns emerge across domains?

Use Evidence From:

- ▶ Subgroup Criteria Bank results
- ▶ Student performance data on grade-level assessments (FAST, EOC, ACCESS, etc.)
- ▶ Progress monitoring data (MTSS / RTII)
- ▶ Learning walks / observations
- ▶ Student work samples

Reflection Area	Notes
Where are strengths consistent across domains?	
Where do risks cluster?	
Which student groups experience the greatest barriers?	
How consistent is implementation likely to be across schools?	
What system-level gaps are evident?	

PART D: ALIGNMENT TO INSTRUCTIONAL VISION

(Refer to previously identified priority instructional shifts and success criteria from the **Vision Refinement** process.)

Discussion Prompt:

How do these findings align with **our school or district's instructional vision**?

Reflection Area	Notes
Where does current practice align with our vision?	
Where does practice diverge from our vision?	
What vision elements are not consistently observable?	
What needs clarification or refinement?	
Where are there misalignments?	
How do these findings confirm, challenge, or further refine our instructional vision?	

PART E: IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Based on findings across domains, identify the non-negotiable features required in the high quality instructional materials (HQIMs) for successful implementation in this school or district context.

▶

▶

▶

▶

▶

▶

PART F: IMPLEMENTATION READINESS & CONDITIONS

Discussion Prompt:

What must be true for successful implementation?

These conditions should be considered prior to adoption and implementation to ensure successful and consistent use of instructional materials.

Reflection Area	Required Conditions	Level of Need
Professional Learning		☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High
Coaching / Support Systems		☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High
Staffing / Expertise		☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High
Assessment & Data Systems		☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High
Intervention / MTSS Alignment		☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High
Accessibility Supports		☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

PART G: DECISION GUIDANCE

Discussion Prompt:

Based on subgroup evidence, committee discussions, public comment, and findings from the final recommendation summary in the **Subgroup Criteria Bank**, what instructional materials recommendation should be advanced by the **district adoption committee**? Consider both the strength of the materials and the district's capacity to implement them with fidelity across schools and student groups.

PART H: NEXT STEPS

Action	Owner	Timeline