# Ellii

## Contents

**ELLII** ..... 1

**Introduction** **2**
The Overall Bottom Line ..... 4

**The Next Generation ESL Curriculum Review Rubric** **5**
Section A: Curricular Structure ..... 5
Section B: Student-Centered Instructional Materials ..... 12

## Introduction

This report was drafted using the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's High-Quality Next Generation ESL Instructional Materials (HQIM-NGESL) review process and rubric. The whole review process and rubric supports evaluation of:

- Whether materials provide a full year's worth of dedicated ESL instruction, as determined by the review panel and given the Massachusetts definition of ESL,
- Whether ESL instructional materials are aligned to the WIDA English Language Development Standards Framework, 2020 Edition (henceforth known as the ELD Framework) – and integrated with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, as determined by the review panel, and
- Quality of ESL instructional materials, as interpreted through the HQIM-NGESL rubric.

The full report features a summary of the results of a panel review of the materials. The review of the materials was done during the 2025-2026 convening of the HQIM-NGESL panel. The panel was comprised of Massachusetts district leaders, classroom educators, and representatives from higher education institutions. It is important to note that the report only summarizes the analysis of the Quality of the ESL instructional materials as interpreted through the HQIM-NGESL rubric. It does not guarantee the quality, scope, or thoroughness of the reviewed materials. It also does not endorse the use of the specific materials reviewed, but simply provides a summary of the information shared by the reviewing panel.

The HQIM-NGESL rubric is divided into two sections. Section A focuses on curricular structure and the coherence of the instructional materials for supporting a trajectory of learning for the year. Section B focuses on whether materials are student-centered and the intentional design of the materials for supporting multilingual learners. Each report:

- Opens with a brief description of the materials that is provided by the publisher or the district that submitted the materials for review,
- Includes a quick reference graphic of the ratings for each of the rubric criteria and a summary of the review of the materials, as described by the review panel, and
- Contains overall-level ratings for each of the rubric criteria, as determined by the review panel, and accompanied by descriptive strengths and challenges, and
- Information from the publisher, such as product specifications.

As you review the report, be sure to consider the following:

- The criteria in the rubric represent selected desired aspects of high quality in ESL materials. While comprehensive and useful for selecting, creating, and improving the quality of ESL instructional materials, the rubric is not, nor can it be, exhaustive. There may be additional criteria your evaluation team determines important to add, based on local needs, EL data, backgrounds, and educator

needs. Data may inform your creation of additional criteria and indicators in the evidence gathering process.

- The report can help teams determine whether they should adopt the ESL Instructional Materials, adopt the ESL Instructional Materials with supplemental guidance and materials to address gaps in quality, adopt materials and create a local plan to address gaps in quality, or to not adopt. HQIM-NGESL reports are only one component of a robust and transparent process to investigate and select high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) for your localized context. Explore our IMplement MA website to learn more about DESE's inclusive four-phase process, resources, and opportunities to support strong selection of high-quality instructional materials that is grounded in a shared vision, informed by localized equity priorities, and supported by diverse stakeholders.

**The Overall Bottom Line**

**Section A: Curricular Structure**
Alignment to MA Definition of ESL – 1
Curricular Map – 1
Unit Language Goals – 1
Lesson Objectives – 1
Assessment – 2
Functional Approach – 2
Shared Responsibility – 1

**Section B – Student-centered Instructional Materials**
Asset-based Orientation – 1
Linguistically Responsive – 1
Critical Stance – 2
Oral Language Development – 2
Formative Assessment – 2
Scaffolds and Supports – 2
Universal Design and Accessibility - 2

4: Evidence is clear and comprehensive; clear connection to four indicators
3: Evidence is present; clear connection to three indicators
2: Evidence is present but insufficient; clear connection to two indicators
0: Evidence is not sufficiently present; connection to one or fewer indicators

**Summary of the Bottom Line**
The panel noted that while Ellii offers a wide range of supplemental ESL resources with strengths in speaking opportunities, assessment tools, and selected content-integrated lessons, there is a lack of evidence of a coherent, standards-aligned, WIDA-connected instructional framework expected for Massachusetts NGESL implementation. Across many criteria, the panel noted a lack of evidence of a coherent set of instructional materials, WIDA-aligned sequencing, unit-level language goals, and systematic scaffolding. It functions more as a searchable library of standalone lessons than a cohesive instructional program.

Ellii may serve as a useful supplemental resource for districts, schools, and educators that can independently align the materials to Massachusetts frameworks; however, as framed currently, it does not demonstrate evidence of being a standalone curriculum that can serve as primary instructional materials.

# The Next Generation ESL Curriculum Review Rubric

## Section A: Curricular Structure

**Alignment to Massachusetts Definition of ESL – 1**
Materials demonstrate clear alignment with the Massachusetts definition of ESL, integrating language development with grade-level content and the ELD Framework

**Strengths:** Ellii includes some elements that partially align with the Massachusetts definition of ESL. The panel noted that in select areas the platform demonstrates a focus on teaching language through content — for example, Academic Vocabulary lessons incorporate content standards into targeted vocabulary instruction and lessons such as the plant cells lesson following CCSS for Grade 6 science. Specific lessons such as 'Identifying the Author's Purpose' correspond with ELA CCSS and promote language development for academic, social, and instructional purposes. Lessons that connect to content areas such as algorithms, science, and U.S. civics also provide examples of content-language integration. The Ellii UP General English series stands out as a more comprehensive set of materials with a progression and targeted language goals, including language functions (e.g., 'describe daily routines'), grammar, and vocabulary. The panel noted that at the more advanced proficiency levels, language learning that aligns to and is derived from disciplinary specific learning becomes more prominent in the materials.

**Challenges:** The panel noted that while some course progressions exist, at times the materials function as isolated lessons targeting specific skills, making it difficult to identify a constant and sustained connection between language and content. Language is frequently taught through isolated grammar practices rather than in rich, contextualized disciplinary specific contexts. There is no explicit connection to grade-level content standards across materials; teachers would need deep knowledge of standards to make those connections independently. The panel also noted that the materials use proficiency descriptors such as 'Low Intermediate' and 'High Beginner' rather than WIDA-aligned terminology.

**Bottom Line:** The panel noted that examples of content-language integration can be found, particularly within the Ellii UP series and select academic vocabulary lessons, these do not represent a systematic or sustained approach. The platform functions primarily as a supplemental resource rather than a curriculum aligned with the Massachusetts definition of ESL, and teachers using the materials would need to align the lessons to grade-level content standards and the ELD Framework.

**Curricular Map – 1**
Materials Provide a clear, year-long curricular map that demonstrates a coherent progression of language development aligned with grade-level content.

**Strengths:** The platform provides a scope and sequence for certain courses, most notably the Ellii UP General English series, which offers targeted language goals with grammar focus, language functions, and vocabulary organized in a progression. Grammar courses include an 'overview' that gives a suggested sequence and timing for lessons, and the Conversational Phrases series includes an overview with learning objectives and a suggested lesson progression. Some content-language driven examples (such as algorithms and civics) provide evidence that language and content instruction are integrated within the platform. The Ellii UP A series has a scope and sequence that can help educators to determine students' starting points.

**Challenges:** The panel noted a lack of an overarching curricular map across the platform in some of the courses. The materials are organized as an open-ended collection of independent lessons and activities rather than coherent units with a year-long progression. Key Language Uses are not explicitly built into course progressions, and no annual benchmarks are identified or connected to courses. Lessons are clustered as K–5 without grade-specific sequencing, and finding material for older grades requires navigating individual lessons without directional guidance on where to begin, how many lessons to use, or how long a course should take. The panel noted an absence of spiraling of instruction and a lack of evidence of units that build upon one another over time.

**Bottom Line:** Although the Ellii UP series demonstrates a loose curricular map, the panel noted a lack of evidence of a coherent, year-long progression that maps language development to grade-level content. The absence of clear units, annual benchmarks, WIDA-aligned sequencing, and spiral instruction means that schools and districts using these materials may need to construct their own curricular map when implementing the materials.

**Unit Language Goals – 1**
Materials present clearly defined unit-level language goals that integrate content standards with language development, providing a coherent focus of instruction over several weeks.

**Strengths:** The panel noted some evidence of unit-level language goals exists within select courses. The Ellii UP General English series includes timing estimates and learning outcomes. The Essay Essentials course provides a course-level objective as well as lesson objectives that build toward it, with a connection to Language of Language Arts and ELA CCSS. The Silver Stars Writing Response–Social Media study pack includes language function goals tied to specific proficiency levels. The UP component more broadly shows some evidence of unit-level language goals within course bundles.

**Challenges:** The panel noted that at times language goals are not present or clearly identified across the materials. Most lessons and study packs are organized around themes with individual lessons but without overarching language goals that guide multi-week instruction. Where unit goals do exist, they do not consistently connect to grade-level content standards or incorporate components of the WIDA 2020 Framework, including Key Language Uses, Language Expectations, or Proficiency Level Descriptors. The panel noted that at times the language goals were vague, and clear evidence of systematic language development tied to unit progressions was absent.

**Bottom Line:** While a small number of courses, particularly Essay Essentials and Ellii UP, demonstrate some evidence of unit-level goal-setting, the panel noted that this was not a systemic feature of the materials. Schools and districts using these materials may need to more clearly define WIDA-aligned unit language goals connected to grade-level content standards in order to ensure the coherence and effectiveness of the instructional materials for Massachusetts ESL contexts.

**Lesson Objectives – 1**
Materials provide clear, actionable lesson-level language objectives that directly support progress toward unit language goals and can be reasonably accomplished within a single lesson.

**Strengths:** Lesson objectives are present in some portions of the platform. The Essay Essentials course includes lesson objectives that build toward the overall course objective, with connections to Language of Language Arts and ELA CCSS. In some lessons, the answer key prompts teachers to review the lesson objective with students, and teacher notes suggest some monitoring techniques. Story Prompts lessons include lesson objectives found in teacher notes, and Grammar Courses include teacher-facing objectives. Panelists noted that some lessons feature language objectives at the beginning of the lesson and are informally reviewed at the end.

**Challenges:** The panel noted that lesson objectives are inconsistent across the platform. Many lessons lack objectives, and at times those that exist are often not student-friendly or written in accessible language. The panelists noted that at times it was difficult to assess whether lesson objectives build toward larger instructional aims due to the inconsistent presence of unit level goals. The answer key and teacher notes are not uniformly present throughout materials, and assessments within lessons do not consistently tie back to stated objectives. The panel noted that objectives tend to reflect large tasks rather than narrowly scoped daily targets. There is limited guidance prompting educators to make objectives visible and comprehensible to students or to encourage self-assessment of daily progress.

**Bottom Line:** Although lesson objectives can be found in portions of the platform, particularly within the Ellii UP and Essay Essentials courses, they are not a consistent feature. The panel noted a lack of student-friendly language, inconsistent presence of teacher guidance, and absence of alignment to unit-level goals. Educators using these materials may need to develop and implement coherent lesson objectives aligned to the Massachusetts ELD Framework.

**Assessment – 2**
Materials include an assessment system that provides multiple opportunities to measure language growth, aligns with curriculum goals and standards, and informs long-term instructional planning.

**Strengths:** The panelists noted that the platform includes a notable quantity and variety of assessment resources. The Assessment and Reflection section contains placement tests, interim assessments, needs assessments, evaluation tools, and student reflection activities such as 3-2-1 exit slips and goal-setting prompts. The Ellii UP series includes mid-course and final assessments covering reading, writing, and listening domains. Assessments are categorized across types including diagnostic assessments, needs assessments, evaluations, student reflections, and student portfolios. The Social Media lesson includes a formal comprehension assessment with embedded writing responses, and Academic 4-Skills Course 2 (Grades 3–5) provides Assessment A, B, and C options. Some lessons also include speaking assessments where students record their responses.

**Challenges:** Despite the quantity of assessment materials, the panelists noted a lack of coherence and consistency. Assessments are not consistently embedded across all lessons and are not systematically tied to lesson or unit objectives. The placement test is limited to 30 minutes and only covers listening, grammar, and reading- omitting writing and speaking. Assessments at different frequencies (unit-level, quarterly, and annual) are not clearly defined or systematically present. It is unclear how assessment data from different intervals is intended to measure language growth over time, and no explicit guidance is provided on how teachers should use assessment data to inform instruction. Practical questions also arise about how to apply the same assessments across the full range of grade levels served by the platform (K–12).

**Bottom Line:** The platform has a variety of assessment resources and tools, including diagnostic, interim, and student reflection options, which represent a strength. However, the panel noted an absence of a coherent, curriculum-embedded assessment system- one that consistently measures all four language domains, connects to lesson and unit objectives, and provides clear interpretive guidance. Teachers using these materials may need to develop and organize assessment tools to build a functional, standards-aligned assessment system to monitor student learning.

**Functional Approach – 2**
Materials implement a purpose-driven approach to language development that explicitly links language forms and functions to communicative goals across academic disciplines.

**Strengths:** The platform includes some lessons that reflect a functional approach. Everyday Dialogues and Functional English lessons (Life and Work section) provide students with real-world language practice. Grammar lessons offer specific examples of language use in context, and the Essay Essentials course engages students in understanding the purpose of specific genres (e.g., the narrative essay) at the discourse level. The Writing in English section (34 lessons, High Beginner through Advanced) provides instruction across dimensions of language including academic and business writing contexts. Sentence stem lessons (Language of Evidence, Language of Inference) also connect language to communicative purposes.

**Challenges:** The panelists noted that while there are examples that illustrate a functional approach to language development in the materials; there was a lack of evidence of a consistent, explicit functional approach embedded throughout the platform. Most lessons tend to focus on the word or sentence level rather than addressing all three dimensions of language (discourse, sentence, and word/phrase) within meaningful disciplinary specific contexts. While the platform includes lessons for functional language in contexts such as a doctor's office or job interview, these are isolated rather than embedded within grade-level disciplinary learning and are not targeted toward specific grade-level audiences. The panelists also noted a lack of evidence of language being consistently taught as a dynamic set of choices in relation to task, purpose, and audience. The panelists also noted that lessons focused on specific purposes do not always go deeply into how language structures work to communicate meaning.

**Bottom Line:** The platform demonstrates partial evidence of a functional approach, particularly in lessons focused on everyday communication and genre-specific writing. However, the panelists noted a lack of evidence that the materials systematically guide teachers to address the three dimensions of language or consistently connect language choices to communicative goals in grade-level disciplinary contexts. Educators using these materials may need to supplement the materials to provide a functional, discipline-specific approach to language development.

**Shared Responsibility – 1**
Materials promote shared expertise, responsibility, and accountability for students in the program.

**Strengths:** The panelists noted that the platform does include student-facing tools such as a Monthly Reflection worksheet and a Digital Literacy Needs Assessment, which may support student-level accountability.

**Challenges:** The panel noted that there is a lack of evidence that the materials support or encourage collaboration between ESL teachers and content area teachers. No tools, protocols, or guidance are provided for shared planning of curriculum, instruction, or assessment. The platform does not include structures for ESL educators to meet with content educators to share multilingual learner performance data, student work, or assessment results. The panel found no evidence of a systematic approach to monitoring EL progress through collaborative means.

**Bottom Line:** There was no evidence found that the materials foster a sense of shared responsibility between ESL and content educators. The platform is designed as an independent ESL resource and the panel did not find evidence of guidance, tools, or structures to facilitate collaboration with classroom teachers or to promote a shared accountability model for EL student success.

## Section B: Student-Centered Instructional Materials

**Asset-based Orientation – 1**
Materials consistently promote an asset-based approach, actively incorporating and building upon students' diverse backgrounds, languages, cultures, experiences, knowledge, and interests to enhance language development and content learning.

**Strengths:** The panelists noted that the platform includes some materials in the current events section that reflect students' diverse cultures and perspectives. The 'American Trailblazers' topic features diverse individuals, and lessons such as the Iran strikes lesson, the protests lesson, and 'The American Dream' engage students in topics connected to broader societal contexts. Students have some opportunities to share about themselves through 'Polls' activities. The panelists noted some examples of learning experiences that incorporate in diverse perspectives such as the Blazing Brazilians, lessons such as one that feature a female biker from Kenya, and the Young Readers Discovery section covers Places and Cultures (e.g., Time Zones).

**Challenges:** While the materials do have some examples of asset-based lessons, the panelists noted a lack of opportunities to systematically and meaningfully incorporate students' diverse linguistic, cultural, or experiential resources into the learning experience. The panelists noted that there were several missed opportunities within the materials to leverage and reflect student identities. Students have little opportunity to develop their identities as multilingual and multicultural individuals through projects, discussions, or reflective activities. Warm-up questions such as 'Do you have friends or family that live far away?' make only minimal connections to students' cultural backgrounds. There is minimal guidance directing educators to gather and integrate information about students' funds of knowledge and home language use is not encouraged or supported.

**Bottom Line:** While some representation of diverse cultures exists, particularly in current events lessons, at times these instances do not make deeper connections between students and the learning and are incidental rather than systematically embedded. The panelists noted an absences of explicit guidance for educators on leveraging students' cultural and linguistic resources is largely absent. Schools and districts using these materials may need to provide additional professional development and supplemental materials to promote a consistent, asset-based approach.

**Linguistically Responsive – 1**
Materials consistently promote linguistically responsive practices, actively supporting the use of students' full linguistic resources while facilitating English language development across all domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing).

**Strengths:** The panelists found some examples, such as the Grammar Growth 1 activities, that support metalinguistic awareness as students engage analytically with grammar. The answer key in the Alexander Graham Bell lesson includes 'Spelling Notes' that highlight differences in English spellings, representing some linguistic variation. A 'My Language Goals' worksheet allows students to track their current skill levels across the four language domains.

**Challenges:** The panel noted a lack of evidence of use of home language being incorporated into the materials, and lack of evidence of activities and guidance to support translanguaging practices. The panel also noted a lack of evidence of explicit instruction on language transfer to help students make connections between their home languages and English and a lack of opportunities for student to develop cross-linguistic awareness. The 'My Language Goals' worksheet lacks teacher guidance for supporting students and for promoting multilingualism. Group projects, such as the Human Rights Project, lack evidence of opportunities for fostering use of students' full linguistic resources. The panel noted no explicit incorporation of strategies for supporting students' ongoing home language development alongside English.

**Bottom Line:** Beyond isolated instances of metalinguistic awareness in grammar activities and spelling comparison notes, the platform does not reflect a linguistically responsive approach. Educators using these materials may need additional guidance and professional development on translanguaging, home language integration, and language transfer to enhance the linguistic responsiveness of the materials.

**Critical Stance – 2**
Materials consistently foster a critical stance, encouraging students to use language as a tool for inquiry, analysis, and action on issues relevant to their lives and communities.

**Strengths:** The platform includes some materials that reflect a critical stance, particularly within the Global Issues and Social Justice collections. Social Justice lessons address racism, activism, and war, and a writing prompt asks students to reflect on experiences of discrimination based on religion, gender, or race. The Sustainable Development Goals section includes 'Banning Plastic Bags,' which supports inquiry from multiple perspectives. The American Dream lesson and the Michael J. Fox lesson (which includes opportunities to research advocacy work) also support aspects of critical engagement. An SEL section covering Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills, and Decision-Making represents a strength in supporting students' social-emotional development.

**Challenges:** The panelists noted inconsistencies in the presence of opportunities for fostering critical stance within the materials- with more opportunities in the materials designed for higher proficiency levels and limited opportunities and exposure to critical inquiry for students at lower proficiency levels. Many critical topics that are incorporated into the materials, such as writing prompts about discrimination, may need to be restructured to ensure that they are addressed in developmentally appropriate ways for younger learners in K–3. The Dilemmas section functions as a game with 'right choices' rather than facilitating genuine critical dialogue. There are no readily located rubrics to support student performance on critical tasks.

**Bottom Line:** The platform shows potential for supporting a critical stance, particularly in the Global Issues, Social Justice, and SEL collections. However, engagement with this content is uneven across proficiency levels. Educators using these materials may need to strengthen the framing of critical inquiry across all proficiency levels.

**Oral Language Development – 2**
Materials provide daily, structured opportunities for all students to engage in meaningful oral interactions that develop listening and speaking skills for social and academic purposes.

**Strengths:** The platform includes a substantial number of speaking and listening opportunities. There are 176 'Discussion Starter' lessons connecting partner conversation to reading and vocabulary learning. Sentence stem lessons encourage sustained conversation, and specific lessons include student-to-student interview activities (e.g., Adverbs of Frequency), discussion questions linked to video content (e.g., Finland Fights Fake News), and warm-up questions embedded in narrative and current events lessons. Young Learner Phonics Stories and Easy News Stories provide oral language practice for a range of levels. A variety of opportunities are provided to practice speaking and listening across the platform.

**Challenges:** While oral language opportunities are present, they lack the explicit structure and scaffolding needed for grade-level instructional conversations and sustained academic discourse. Many topics may not be appropriate for all age groups, and it is not always clear to teachers which lessons are intended for which grade levels (e.g., the Debate section). Discussions are primarily peer-focused, with limited structures for student-adult academic interaction. Lessons are inconsistent in connecting oral discourse to other language modalities. The panelists noted a lack of evidence of consistent prompts for leveraging student linguistic assets or encouraging translanguaging in oral contexts. Explicit sentence frames, structures for pushing student thinking, and support for sustaining academic discourse were not systematically embedded across lessons.

**Bottom Line:** The platform offers a wide variety of speaking and listening opportunities, and the Discussion Starters and sentence stem sections represent strengths. However, the panelists noted an absence of systematic, grade-differentiated structures for sustained academic oral interaction and inconsistency in connecting oral discourse to other modalities. Educators using these materials may need to supplement the materials with additional scaffolds to support structured, extended, academic discourse.

**Formative Assessment - 2**
Materials integrate formative assessment practices throughout instruction, providing tools and strategies for teachers and students to monitor learning, adjust teaching, and support language growth in real time.

**Strengths:** The platform includes a range of formative assessment tools. The Assessments and Reflection section provides exit tickets, peer evaluation forms, weekly reflections, 3-2-1 tools, and student portfolio structures. Writing and speaking rubrics are available in some Story Prompt lessons. Some lessons include embedded formal comprehension assessments (e.g., the Social Media lesson) and speaking assessments where students record responses. The answer key for individual lessons prompts teachers to review lesson objectives with students, and teacher notes suggest monitoring techniques. Language Scenes worksheets can also be used for formative assessment purposes.

**Challenges:** The panelists noted that while present, formative assessment tools are not consistently embedded across lessons nor are they systematically tied to lesson or unit objectives. The panelists also noted a lack of guidance on how to implement many of these tools as formative assessments, and there is limited guidance on how to measure or interpret results to adjust instruction. Self-assessment and peer assessment structures are inconsistently present. Many tools sit in a separate section of the platform rather than being built into the instructional sequence, requiring teachers to independently locate and integrate them. The panel noted a lack of clear teacher-facing guidance on adjusting instruction based on formative data.

**Bottom Line:** The platform provides a variety of formative assessment resources, from exit tickets to rubrics to reflective tools, which represent a strength of the materials. However, the panel noted a lack of systematic embedding within lessons, insufficient teacher guidance on implementation and interpretation, and inconsistent connection to lesson objectives. Schools and districts using these materials may need to provide additional professional development on the integration of formative assessment into lesson design and clearer instructional guidance on how to use formative assessments to drive instruction.

**Scaffolds and Supports – 2**
Materials provide a range of scaffolding strategies and supports that assist students in accessing grade-level content and developing language, with guidance on how to gradually remove supports as students gain proficiency.

**Strengths:** The panel noted that the platform includes a variety of scaffolding resources. The Sentence Stems section (10 lessons, Low Intermediate through High Intermediate) provides language frames for academic communication, including the Language of Evidence, Reflection, Inference, Opinions, Presenting, and Recounting. The David Beckham lesson includes grammar review with sentence frames and vocabulary practice. Word banks, glossaries, and graphic organizers appear in select lessons. The platform is organized by proficiency level, which itself represents a form of scaffolding. Suffix flashcards and interactive vocabulary tools provide additional targeted linguistic support.

**Challenges:** Scaffolds and supports are sporadically embedded within certain lessons and are not systematically built into the instructional sequence across the platform. The panelists noted that the lesson framing does not consistently make explicit which scaffolds are intended for which proficiency levels, and it is not clear how supports are meant to be gradually removed as students gain proficiency. Many denser readings lack multiple means of accessing the content such as visual supports, and there are limited opportunities to build background knowledge before engaging with complex texts. Scaffolding for higher-order thinking is inconsistent. Teacher answer keys and notes do not consistently identify scaffolding strategies as part of instructional guidance.

**Bottom Line:** The platform has a range of scaffolding resources available but these are not systematically integrated into lesson-level instruction. Educators using these materials may need additional explicit guidance on when and how to identify and implement appropriate supports for their students.

**Universal Design and Accessibility – 2**
Materials provide varied means for accessing the content and demonstrating learning, helping teachers meet the diverse needs and abilities of a variety of students, including those with different abilities and those working above or below grade level.

**Strengths:** The platform incorporates some elements of multimodal and accessible design. Videos include closed captioning and speed adjustment options, and some texts are accompanied by read-aloud features. The platform includes Microsoft's Immersive Reader in certain contexts. Project-based lessons such as the Human Rights Project offer multiple modes for demonstrating learning, including poster creation. The Rubrics and Tools section provides resources for multimodal demonstration of learning. Digital tools that allow students to provide verbal responses are also present in some lessons. Materials are generally able to help teachers meet diverse needs, incorporating technology and scaffolds across different contexts.

**Challenges:** The panelists noted that UDL principles are not consistently or proactively applied across the platform. Differentiation for students with disabilities is not explicitly addressed in teacher guidance and there is no evidence of materials explicitly prompting educators to attend to the needs of ELs with IEPs or 504 plans. The panelists noted that accessible features, such as closed captioning and read-aloud, are inconsistent across lessons, and educators may need to manually identify lessons with accessibility features. Multimodal opportunities to engage, communicate, and demonstrate learning are present in some lessons but absent in many others.

**Bottom Line:** The platform demonstrates some accessibility features in select areas, particularly video captioning, speed adjustment, and Immersive Reader, but the panelists noted that these are not consistently applied across materials. Schools and districts using these materials may need to provide additional professional learning and guidance on supporting ELs with disabilities and leveraging UDL supports to promote accessibility and inclusive design.