

<p>Which publisher is this review for?</p>	<p>Science Bits Grades 7 & 8 combined</p>
<p>1. Please outline your reasons for not passing the materials in your original review. Note any standards you felt were not addressed.</p>	<p>I have taught science for 15 years. I felt that the material lacked rigor and there was no difference in the material between grade levels. There was also much extraneous material that was not part of the grade level standards. As a result, that would be confusing the teachers to determine what should (and should not) be included. The labs also lacked the rigor needed for science and preparation for upcoming high school years for our students.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No, my concerns were not addressed. The presenter did a phone call into the conference room where the reviewers listened. The presenter described technical reasons why we didn't pass the material and clearly felt that we could not navigate the site properly and that we were not clicking in the right places. I had two concerns from that - 1. The presenter did not change any of the material to reflect my concern with rigor and 2. The material, which still lacked rigor, should not be difficult for students and teachers to find. Middle school students have trouble navigating lots of software (from my experience in a school where all students have devices). Students should not have trouble accessing material based on site design. But again, my main reason for not passing the material is that it lacked rigor.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>I did re-review the materials to determine if it should again pass. I again failed the material. This was because the publisher did not change any of the material despite my review that stated it lacked rigor and had extraneous materials. In the appeal, publisher stated that they did not make changes to the material. He simply tried to explain that we weren't clicking in the right places. I think the publisher failed to recognize the true issue with the materials - the rigor. I felt that they publisher didn't follow the appeal process correctly by addressing the specific concerns I listed.</p>
<p>4. After reading the publishers' letters to the commission, do you find reason to reconsider your original score?</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>Which publisher is this review for?</p>	<p>Science Bits Grade 8</p>
<p>1. Please outline your reasons for not passing the materials in your original review. Note any standards you felt were not addressed.</p>	<p>Science Bits is missing a lot of information that are 8th grade standards. For instance, there is no information on space exploration, the position of the sun, moon, and earth. There is also no mention of eclipses or ocean tides.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No, first off there was hardly a presentation as they did it via the web, and they couldn't show us where the material was supposed to be, they have also not made any changes since the appeal. There was no material given at the appeal.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>I did not re review the material after the appeal because there were no changes made from the first review.</p>
<p>4. After reading the publishers' letters to the commission, do you find reason to reconsider your original score?</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>Which publisher is this review for?</p>	<p>Science Bits Grade 8</p>
<p>1. Please outline your reasons for not passing the materials in your original review. Note any standards you felt were not addressed.</p>	<p>I could not find anything on fossils, how waves played a role in communication systems, geologic hot spots, groundwater resources.</p> <p>Standards missing: 8.PS4:3, 8.LS4:1, 2, 8.ESS2:1, 8.ESS3:1, 2, 8.ETS1:1</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>I don't think they did a good job on addressing our concerns. They just seemed to talk about how good the program was.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>If a school district adopts this program they better have a full day of PD for the teachers. There is probably more here than I could figure out in a few hours. I did not feel like the material was easy to navigate and from what I could find it had numerous parts of standards missing. If I was the only one of the 3 reviewers, I would blame my technology abilities for missing a lot of material. However, I think all 3 of us had concerns with this program and it's correlation to state standards.</p>
<p>4. After reading the publishers' letters to the commission, do you find reason to reconsider your original score?</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>Which publisher is this review for?</p>	<p>Science Bits Grade 7</p>
<p>1. Please outline your reasons for not passing the materials in your original review. Note any standards you felt were not addressed.</p>	<p>The material offered for review had the following results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There was a lack of continuity between the standards. There was a simple response to how molecules are the minutest portion of an organism. It is then chunked and goes directly into cell organelles and then quickly progress into cell types. 2. The Life Science portion of the science bit did not make a smooth transition from one topic to the next to ensure the progression of knowledge was evident, as well as make those cross-cutting connections between organisms and their manipulation of energy. 3. There were no ardent issues with the interphase of the program; the technology was streamlined and easy to navigate. However, information such as Earth and Human Activity were placed randomly throughout the chapter or only had one or two sentences as the descriptors.
<p>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.</p>	<p>My chief concern was that students would have to continually search for material throughout the text. There was continually inconsistency in the length and breadth of the content that was provided for each content area. Some parts were a simple no because there was content that was absent and could not be given any feedback at all.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>I did re-review the materials as a part of my duty to ensure that Tennessee students were receiving the best possible product. Online content is always the best because it can be easily updated to address discoveries that students should be made aware of. More training on how to use the add-ons would have been great. However, the ability to find the information was easy, but if it is not there, then it is not there.</p>
<p>4. After reading the publishers' letters to the commission, do you find reason to reconsider your original score?</p>	<p>No</p>