

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

High-Quality Instructional Materials Review Rubric

Advanced Placement

Evaluator		Rating Committee	
Publisher			
Title of Textbook Series/Instructional Program			
Grade Range of Textbook Series/Instructional Program		Specific Grade Evaluated	

This evaluation rubric is designed to evaluate assess the extent to which instructional materials align with the *Advanced Placement English Language Arts courses*, as well as additional indicators of high-quality instructional materials for the ELA curricula. The evaluation rubric includes key considerations for high-quality instructional materials and outlines three **Gateways** for evaluating materials. Within each **Gateway**, **Criterion**, and related **Indicators** are provided along with **Guiding Questions** and **Evidence**.



The evaluation rubric is designed to help reviewers establish a quality threshold for each Gateway. Reviewers should focus on the content present in the instructional materials and any ancillary or complementary resources rather than on what may be inferred. All scores should be based on evidence observed from the instructional materials themselves.

Scoring Protocol and Criteria:

- **No evidence (0):** There is no correlation between the standards and lessons; a logical sequence of content cannot be identified, significant content inaccuracies exist, essential understandings, knowledge, or skills are not addressed, and opportunities to practice essential skills are excluded.
- **Limited (2 or 3):** Limited connections between the standards and the lessons are noted; content may contain some inaccuracies or may not always be clear. Essential understanding, knowledge, or skills are not sufficiently addressed, and there is limited opportunity for students to practice essential skills.
- **Adequate (3 or 5):** Lessons align with the standards; content appears accurate, clear, and in sequential order. Most essential understandings, knowledge, and skills are supported, and many opportunities are provided for students to practice these essential skills.

The High-Quality Instructional Materials Review Rubric is comprised of three sections:

Gateway 1: Alignment to Standards - **This is a requirement for submission.**

→ Advance to Gateway 2 only if Gateway 1 scores at least **21 points**.

Gateway 2: Rigor and Instructional Practices - **This is a requirement for submission.**

→ Advance to Gateway 3 only if Gateway 2 scores at least **18 points**.

Gateway 3: Usability

GATEWAY 1

Alignment to Standards - This is a required submission.

High-quality materials provide all students with extensive opportunities to engage with grade-level content, fulfilling the complete intent of the *AP English Language and Composition* and *AP English Literature and Composition Course and Exam Descriptions*. Educators use evidence from instructional materials to evaluate indicators relevant to each criterion and assess the Gateway rating.

- **Criterion 1.1 (1a – 1e): Alignment and Accuracy 23 possible points**
- **Criterion 1.2 (1f – 1j): Learning Progressions and Coherence 19 possible points**

Criterion 1.1: ALIGNMENT AND ACCURACY			
INDICATORS OF SUPERIOR QUALITY	GUIDING QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS May include but not limited to the following:	EVIDENCE OF HOW THE MATERIALS SUPPORT THE CONTENT	SCORE
1a. Materials fully align to AP English Language and/or AP English Literature Course and Exam Description standards and learning objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are AP learning objectives explicitly identified within lessons and units? • Do materials address all required course skills and content outlined in the AP Course and Exam Description? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AP standards identified in lesson plans and units • Standards correlation documents • Evidence of full standards coverage 	0 3 5
1b. Materials reflect research-based literacy practices and AP instructional expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do materials employ evidence-based literacy practices? • Are students engaged in close reading, discussion, writing, and analysis? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close reading routines • Writing workshop structures • Collaborative discussions • Teacher instructional supports 	0 2 3
1c. Materials provide regular opportunities for close reading, textual analysis, and evidence-based discussion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are students required to analyze complex texts? • Are text-dependent discussions and questions embedded throughout instruction? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annotation activities • Text-dependent questions • Socratic seminars • Evidence-based discussions 	0 3 5
1d. Materials develop AP-level writing skills, including rhetorical analysis, literary analysis, argumentation, and synthesis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are students engaged in all major AP writing modes? • Do writing tasks require analysis and use of textual evidence? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AP-style essays • Writing rubrics • Extended writing opportunities • Writing exemplars 	0 3 5

<p>1e. Texts, tasks, and assessments reflect AP-level complexity, rigor, and expectations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do texts meet AP complexity expectations? Do assessments mirror AP exam demands? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complex literary and informational texts AP-style assessments Timed writing tasks Multiple-choice practice aligned to AP expectations 	<p>0 3 5</p>
<p>TOTAL SCORE CRITERION 1.1 Meets: 18-23 points Partially Meets: 12-17 points Does Not Meet: 0-11 points</p>			
<p>Criterion 1.2: LEARNING PROGRESSIONS and COHERENCE</p>			
<p>INDICATORS OF SUPERIOR QUALITY</p>	<p>GUIDING QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS May include but not limited to the following:</p>	<p>EVIDENCE OF HOW THE MATERIALS SUPPORT THE CONTENT</p>	<p>SCORE</p>
<p>1f. Materials follow a logical progression of reading, writing, and analytical skills throughout the course.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do lessons build in complexity over time? Is there a coherent progression of skills and concepts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scope and sequence documents Unit progression charts Increasing text and task complexity 	<p>0 3 5</p>
<p>1g. Materials intentionally connect new learning to prior knowledge and previously taught concepts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are previous concepts revisited and strengthened? Are explicit connections made across units? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spiral review activities Connections to prior learning Recurring analytical practices 	<p>0 2 3</p>
<p>1h. Materials gradually release responsibility to students, leading to independent reading, writing, and analysis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do lessons move from teacher support to independent application? Are scaffolds intentionally removed over time? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modeled instruction Guided practice Independent performance tasks 	<p>0 2 3</p>
<p>1i. Reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language skills are integrated throughout instruction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are literacy skills taught in an integrated manner? Do students apply multiple skills within lessons and assessments? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion-to-writing tasks Integrated literacy activities Multi-modal assignments 	<p>0 2 3</p>
<p>1j. Texts, tasks, and assessments are sequenced coherently to support mastery of AP course skills and objectives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does instruction build toward mastery of AP expectations? Are assessments aligned to instructional progression? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit assessments aligned to instruction Scaffolded assignments AP skill progression documentation 	<p>0 3 5</p>

TOTAL SCORE CRITERION 1.2 Meets: 15-19 points Partially Meets: 10-14 points Does Not Meet: 0-9 points	0 3 5
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

Gateway 1 Points AVAILABLE	Gateway 1 Points ACHIEVED	GATEWAY 1 RATING
42	Sum of points from Criterion 1.1 and 1.2	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets (score of 33-42 points) PROCEED TO GATEWAY 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets (score of 21-32 points) PROCEED TO GATEWAY 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet (score of 0-20 points) STOP REVIEW

GATEWAY 2

Rigor and Instructional Practices - This is a required submission.

Gateway 2 examines how materials support students in meeting the rigorous expectations of **Advanced Placement English Language and Composition** and **Advanced Placement English Literature and Composition**. Materials should engage students in close reading, textual analysis, academic discourse, evidence-based writing, and critical thinking while preparing them for AP coursework and assessments.

- **Criterion 2.1 (2a – 2d): Student Learning 16 possible points**
- **Criterion 2.2 (2e – 2i): Instructional Design 19 possible points**

Criterion 2.1: STUDENT LEARNING			
INDICATORS OF SUPERIOR QUALITY	GUIDING QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS May include but not limited to the following:	EVIDENCE OF HOW THE MATERIALS SUPPORT THE CONTENT	SCORE
2a. Students engage in close reading, textual analysis, and evidence-based discussion of complex texts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do students analyze literary and informational texts independently and collaboratively? • Are discussions grounded in textual evidence? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annotation protocols • Text-dependent questions • Socratic seminars • Evidence-based discussions 	0 3 5
2b. Students develop and support claims through literary analysis, rhetorical analysis, argumentation, and synthesis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are students required to construct and defend claims using textual evidence? • Are multiple AP writing modes included? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literary analysis essays • Rhetorical analysis essays • Argument essays • Synthesis tasks and research activities 	0 3 5
2c. Students analyze texts within historical, cultural, rhetorical, and thematic contexts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do students examine how context influences meaning? • Are multiple perspectives explored? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contextual analysis activities • Historical and cultural background resources • Comparative text studies 	0 2 3
2d. Students communicate ideas through discussion, writing, presentations, and other authentic formats for varied audiences and purposes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are students given multiple opportunities to communicate their thinking? • Do tasks require adaptation for different audiences and purposes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations • Academic discussions • Writing assignments • Multimedia and performance-based tasks. 	0 2 3

TOTAL SCORE CRITERION 2.1			
Meets: 13-16 points Partially Meets: 8-12 points Does Not Meet: 0-11 points			
Criterion 2.2 INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN			
INDICATORS OF SUPERIOR QUALITY	GUIDING QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS May include but not limited to the following:	EVIDENCE OF HOW THE MATERIALS SUPPORT THE CONTENT	SCORE
2e. Lessons employ a variety of evidence-based instructional strategies to foster engagement and deep understanding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do lessons include varied instructional approaches? Are strategies aligned to AP learning goals? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions Modeling Writing workshops Independent and collaborative learning activities 	0 2 3
2f. Students have regular opportunities to collaborate with peers and teachers to build understanding and academic discourse skills.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are collaborative structures intentionally embedded? Do discussions deepen understanding? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner activities Small-group discussions Socratic seminars Peer review protocols 	0 2 3
2g. Students engage with open-ended questions and authentic issues that require critical thinking and evidence-based reasoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are students challenged with complex questions? Do tasks require analysis and evaluation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essential questions Inquiry-based discussions Open-ended writing tasks Text-based investigations 	0 3 5
2h. Materials provide opportunities for reflection, metacognition, and goal setting to support student ownership of learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do students reflect on their learning and growth? Are self-monitoring tools provided? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflection journals Self-assessment tools Goal-setting activities Revision protocols 	0 2 3
2i. Materials include regular opportunities for students to engage in authentic AP-style assessments and performance tasks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do assessments reflect AP exam expectations? Are students provided opportunities to practice AP task types? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP-style multiple-choice questions Timed writing tasks AP-aligned rubrics Practice exams and scoring activities 	0 3 5
TOTAL SCORE CRITERION 2.2			
Meets: 15-19 points Partially Meets: 10-14 points Does Not Meet: 0-9 points			

Gateway 2 Points AVAILABLE	Gateway 2 Points ACHIEVED	GATEWAY 2 RATING
<p>35</p>	<p>Sum of points from Criterion 2.1 and 2.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Meets (score of 28-35 points) PROCEED TO GATEWAY 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets (score of 18-37 points) PROCEED TO GATEWAY 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet (score of 0-17 points) STOP REVIEW

GATEWAY 3

Usability

Materials help teachers effectively implement AP English Language and Composition and AP English Literature and Composition curricula while supporting student success, monitoring progress, and providing access to rigorous content. This gateway focuses on teacher supports, assessment systems, student supports, and intentional design. Adapted from the original Gateway 3 structure.

- **Criterion 3.1 (3a – 3d): Teacher Supports 16 possible points**
- **Criterion 3.2 (3e – 3g): Assessment 13 possible points**
- **Criterion 3.3 (3h – 3j): Student Supports 13 possible points**
- **Criterion 3.4 (3k – 3n): Intentional Design 14 possible points**

Criterion 3.1: TEACHER SUPPORTS			
INDICATORS OF SUPERIOR QUALITY	GUIDING QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS May include but not limited to the following:	EVIDENCE OF HOW THE MATERIALS SUPPORT THE CONTENT	SCORE
3a. Materials include clear guidance and annotations to help teachers effectively implement lessons and support student engagement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do materials provide comprehensive lesson guidance? • Are implementation supports provided throughout the program? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson annotations • Teacher notes • Instructional guidance • Strategies for student engagement 	0 3 5
3b. Materials provide detailed explanations and examples to deepen teachers' understanding of literary, rhetorical, and writing concepts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do materials support teacher content knowledge? • Are examples provided to clarify complex concepts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content background information • Literary and rhetorical explanations • Writing exemplars 	0 3 5
3c. Materials include curriculum-based professional learning supports for initial and ongoing implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are professional learning opportunities embedded? • Do supports mirror student learning experiences? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional learning modules • Reflection tools • Coaching supports • Collaborative learning opportunities 	0 2 3

3d. Materials include flexible implementation plans, pacing guides, and adaptation guidance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are multiple implementation options provided? • Can materials be adapted to various schedules and contexts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pacing guides • Alternative implementation models • Scheduling recommendations 	0 2 3
TOTAL SCORE CRITERION 3.1 Meets: 13-16 points Partially Meets: 9-12 points Does Not Meet: 0-8 points			
Criterion 3.2: ASSESSMENTS			
INDICATORS OF SUPERIOR QUALITY	GUIDING QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS May include but not limited to the following:	EVIDENCE OF HOW THE MATERIALS SUPPORT THE CONTENT	SCORE
3e. Materials clearly identify assessed AP standards and learning objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are standards explicitly connected to assessments? • Is full standards coverage evident? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards correlation charts • Assessment blueprints • Learning objective mapping 	0 2 3
3f. Materials include multiple formative and summative assessments with guidance for interpreting student performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are assessment opportunities distributed throughout the course? • Is teacher guidance provided for instructional decision-making? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formative assessments • Summative assessments • Teacher guidance documents • Intervention recommendations 	0 3 5
3g. Assessments require students to demonstrate AP-level expectations through varied and complex tasks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do assessments measure higher-order thinking? • Do tasks mirror AP exam expectations? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literary analysis essays • Rhetorical analysis essays • Argument essays • Synthesis tasks • AP-style multiple-choice questions 	0 3 5
TOTAL SCORE CRITERION 3.2 Meets: 10-13 points Partially Meets: 7-9 points Does Not Meet: 0-6 points			
Criterion 3.3: STUDENT SUPPORTS			
INDICATORS OF SUPERIOR QUALITY	GUIDING QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS May include but not limited to the following:	EVIDENCE OF HOW THE MATERIALS SUPPORT THE CONTENT	SCORE
3h. Materials provide supports that help students actively engage in rigorous AP-level learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are scaffolds provided without reducing rigor? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annotation supports • Discussion supports • Writing scaffolds 	0 3 5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do supports encourage participation and independence? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading guides 	
3i. Materials provide enrichment opportunities that extend learning beyond course-level expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do extensions deepen learning rather than simply add work? Are opportunities available for advanced analysis? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extension activities Research opportunities Independent inquiry tasks 	0 2 3
3j. Materials provide supports for multilingual learners and students with diverse language needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are language supports embedded throughout instruction? Are disciplinary language demands addressed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic vocabulary supports Sentence frames Glossaries Language-development strategies 	0 3 5
TOTAL SCORE CRITERION 3.3			
Meets: 10-13 points Partially Meets: 7-9 points Does Not Meet: 0-6 points			
Criterion 3.4: INTENTIONAL DESIGN			
INDICATORS OF SUPERIOR QUALITY	GUIDING QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS May include but not limited to the following:	EVIDENCE OF HOW THE MATERIALS SUPPORT THE CONTENT	SCORE
3k. Materials incorporate digital tools and resources that enhance literacy learning and AP course objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do digital tools support instruction and learning goals? Are resources integrated purposefully? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annotation platforms Writing tools Research databases Interactive learning resources 	0 3 5
3l. Digital components provide opportunities for collaboration among students and teachers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do digital resources support meaningful collaboration? Are collaboration features embedded within instruction? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared documents Discussion boards Peer review platforms 	0 2 3
3m. Visual elements and organizational features support understanding and ease of use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are materials organized logically? Do visual elements enhance learning? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent layout Effective navigation Relevant graphics and visuals 	0 2 3
3n. Materials provide clear guidance for technology use and compatibility with common school systems and devices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are technology requirements clearly explained? Are platforms compatible with common systems? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology guides LMS compatibility documentation User support resources 	0 2 3

TOTAL SCORE CRITERION 3.4 Meets: 11-14 points Partially Meets: 7-10 points Does Not Meet: 0-6 points

Gateway 3 Points AVAILABLE	Gateway 3 Points ACHIEVED	GATEWAY 3 RATING
56	Sum of Criterion 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 points	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets (score of 45-56 points) <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets (score of 28-44 points) <input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet (score of 0-27 points)

TOTAL SCORE (Gateway 1, 2, and 3)			
GATEWAY 1	GATEWAY 2	GATEWAY 3	GRAND TOTAL
of 42 points	of 35 points	of 56 points	of 133 points