

Committee Composition Planning Template: Special Populations

**Building Representative and Effective Instructional
Materials Adoption Teams**



Committee Composition Planning Template: Special Populations

Building Representative and Effective Instructional Materials Adoption Teams

Accessibility Domain	Title	Description	Purpose	Page
	Purpose of This Tool	Explains the intent, scope, and use of the Committee Composition Planning Tool within the instructional materials review and adoption process	Establish a shared understanding of how the tool supports planning and decision-making	2
Section 1	Committee Composition Overview	Lists proposed committee members along with their roles, content areas, and areas of expertise	Identify who is participating in the materials review process and ensure visibility into team composition	3
Section 2	Required	Verifies whether key roles and perspectives (e.g., leadership, teachers, specialists) are included on the committee	Ensure essential stakeholders are represented to support comprehensive and informed decision-making	4
Section 3	Subgroup Expertise Check	Reviews whether the committee includes expertise aligned to key student groups (e.g., SWD, MLL, intervention, advanced learners)	Identify gaps in expertise related to student populations and ensure subgroup needs are considered during evaluation	5
Section 4	Balance &	Provides discussion prompts to evaluate the diversity of perspectives and representation across contexts (e.g., schools, grade levels)	Ensure the committee reflects a range of instructional, implementation, and student-centered perspectives	6
Section 5	Roles &	Defines expectations and responsibilities for each role within the committee	Support clarity, accountability, and effective collaboration during the review process	7
Section 6	Final Readiness Check	Confirms whether the committee is prepared to begin the evaluation process using the established tools and protocols	Ensure the committee has the structure, expertise, and readiness needed for effective materials review	8

PURPOSE OF THIS TOOL

This tool supports districts in assembling instructional materials adoption committees that include the necessary expertise to evaluate materials for all student groups, including multilingual learners and students with disabilities.

A well-composed committee ensures that:

- ▶ subgroup considerations are embedded in decision-making
- ▶ materials are evaluated from multiple perspectives
- ▶ implementation needs are identified early

This tool is designed to be used in conjunction with the **Subgroup Criteria Bank** and **District Reflection Tool** to ensure that materials evaluation and decision-making are informed by appropriate expertise.

A well-composed committee is a critical first step in ensuring that instructional materials decisions lead to equitable outcomes for all students.

SECTION 1: COMMITTEE COMPOSITION OVERVIEW

Directions: List all proposed committee members and identify their roles and areas of expertise.

Name	Role	Content Area	School/Dept.	Subgroup Expertise (if applicable)

SECTION 2: SUGGESTED REPRESENTATION CHECK

Directions: Indicate whether each required role is represented on the committee.

Role / Perspective	Included?	Notes/Names
Curriculum & Instruction Leadership	☐ Yes ☐ No	
School-Based Administrator	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Classroom Teacher (General Education)	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Content Area Specialist (ELA/Math/Science, etc.)	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Exceptional Student Education (ESE) / Special Education	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Multilingual Learner (MLL/ELL) Specialist	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Intervention / MTSS Specialist	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Instructional Coach	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Assessment / Data Specialist	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Parents (Statutory Requirement)	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Community Members	☐ Yes ☐ No	

SECTION 3: SUBGROUP EXPERTISE CHECK

Directions: Review whether the committee includes expertise aligned to key student groups.

Subgroup / Area of Need	Representation Present?	Notes/Gaps
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	☐ Yes ☐ No	
English Language Learners (ELL)	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE)	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Students with intersecting needs (e.g., English Language Learners with Disabilities, etc.)	☐ Yes ☐ No	

Identifying Missing Expertise

If any of the above areas are marked “No”, districts should either:

- ▶ add committee members with relevant expertise, OR
- ▶ establish a process to consult experts during review

SECTION 4: BALANCE & REPRESENTATION REFLECTION

Discussion Prompt:

- ▶ Does the committee reflect a range of school contexts (grade levels, demographics)?
- ▶ Are both instructional and implementation perspectives represented?
- ▶ Will this group be able to identify both strengths and risks in materials?
- ▶ Are voices included that can speak to subgroup access?
- ▶ Are perspectives included that can speak to implementation feasibility across different school contexts?

Notes:

SECTION 5: ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

Directions: Clarify expectations for committee members.

Role	Primary Responsibility
Committee Lead	Facilitate process, ensure alignment to district goals
Content Experts	Evaluate alignment to standards and rigor
ESE / SWD Representatives	Evaluate accessibility, accommodations, and usability
MLL Specialists	Evaluate language development and access
Teachers	Evaluate usability and classroom implementation
Coaches / Specialists	Identify support and professional learning needs
Data / Assessment Staff	Evaluate alignment to assessment systems
School Leader / Administrator	Evaluate feasibility of implementation across schools and alignment to school-level systems
Parents	Provide family perspectives on instructional materials, including accessibility, usability, communication, student engagement, and alignment to student and community needs

SECTION 6: FINAL READINESS CHECK

Discussion Prompt: Is this committee prepared to evaluate materials using the Subgroup Criteria Bank and District Reflection Tool?

Readiness Area	Yes / No	Notes / Next Steps
All required roles represented	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Subgroup expertise included	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Members understand evaluation tools	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Time and structure for review established	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Facilitation plan in place	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Subgroup perspectives are actively integrated into discussion protocols	☐ Yes ☐ No	