

Which publisher is this review for?	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Grade 3 Science
1. Please outline your reasons for not passing the materials in your original review. Note any standards you felt were not addressed.	Originally in section I review, I felt like there was information lacking for certain standards in terms of detail and specificity for a teacher to adequately and sufficiently address the standard and teach it well to his/her students in the classroom. I feel a few sentences were added to supplement information but a few sentences would not help me teach the material as in depth as I am required to for students to master the standard. I also felt like the Inquiry Flipchart was not a "student tool" but rather a "teacher tool" and it was questionable to me that the students would not have access readily. There was also some extraneous information that the company did, in fact, delete after the first review.
2. Based on the publishers' presentation to panelists and any materials provided at that presentation, were the concerns you had in your original screening of the materials addressed? Please provide a brief summary of your concerns and what you feel was addressed at the appeal.	The company somewhat addressed concerns in terms of editing and deleting the extraneous information and adding a few sentences for some standards I did not feel were addressed the first time. I did not feel that a few sentences on a few pages regarding a specific tested standard was sufficient for passing the textbook altogether. As a teacher who is reviewing the textbooks I was reviewing based on addressing of standards as the #1 goal and even upon resubmission and appeals, I did not think the added information was detailed or sufficient enough for a teacher to only use the textbook and not look elsewhere for more information on the standard to teach it to the state's expectations.
3. Upon consideration of the publishers' presentation to panelists, what action, if any, did you take and why? In particular, please explain why you did or did not re-review the materials after the presentation.	Again, I did not feel that a few of the standards were met with 100% certainty. That was the only reason I chose not to pass after the appeals hearing. The added information was only a few sentences to address the standard and I did not feel it was sufficient for example on biodiversity.
4. After reading the publishers' letters to the commission, do you find reason to reconsider your original score?	Yes
Please Explain	HMH has supplied evidence for which they feel their material meets the standards and I am giving them the benefit of the doubt that they have included enough detail for a teacher to adequately and sufficiently teach the standard to student mastery of content and not have to look anywhere else for material to supplement what is in the textbook.

Which publisher is this review for?	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Grade 3 Science
1. Please outline your reasons for not passing the materials in your original review. Note any standards you felt were not addressed.	The standards not addressed in my original review are as followed: PS 1.2, PS2.2, and LS2.1.
2. Based on the publishers' presentation to panelists and any materials provided at that presentation, were the concerns you had in your original screening of the materials addressed? Please provide a brief summary of your concerns and what you feel was addressed at the appeal.	The publisher's statement reads, "We elected to focus our efforts in responding to two of the panelists to attempt to achieve the 100% alignment required." I was the third panelist. None of my standards were addressed in the revisions and remain unaddressed in the publisher's response. Addressed standards in the response are: 3LS1, 3LS4, 3ETS1, and ESS2.
3. Upon consideration of the publishers' presentation to panelists, what action, if any, did you take and why? In particular, please explain why you did or did not re-review the materials after the presentation.	After the presentation, I attempted to review the materials. However, HMH only addressed 2 out of the 3 panelists in order to obtain 100% alignment of materials. I was the 3rd reviewer, so my concerns were not addressed in the revisions. Thus, I was unable to re-review.
4. After reading the publishers' letters to the commission, do you find reason to reconsider your original score?	No

***Note: A third reviewer for Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Grade 3 had previously passed the material in their Section 2 Review. This brings the total to 2 reviewers scoring as passed and 1 as not passed.**