

ATTACHMENT
Text of Proposed Amendment to 19 TAC

Chapter 67. State Review and Approval of Instructional Materials

Subchapter B. State Review and Approval

§67.27. IMRA Reviewers: Eligibility and Appointment.

- (a) All instructional materials review and approval (IMRA) reviewers must complete an application. The application will include a resume and supervisor, if applicable, or another reference contact information and must request any professional associations, affiliations, and groups in a format approved by the State Board of Education (SBOE) chair. SBOE members shall have access to all completed applications in their respective districts.
- (b) The IMRA reviewer application shall be posted to the SBOE website.
- (c) An IMRA reviewer may serve as a quality reviewer or as a suitability reviewer.
- (d) Quality reviewers.
 - (1) IMRA quality reviewers must meet one of the following minimum qualification requirements:
 - (A) educators with three or more years of experience;
 - (B) district or campus personnel who have taught and/or directly supported the grade level(s) and subject area(s) or course(s) for at least three years;
 - (C) professors at an accredited institution of higher education in Texas with at least three years or more experience in the subject area(s) or courses; or
 - (D) persons with evidence of strong content knowledge and experience in the grade level(s) and subject area(s) or course(s).
 - (2) The Texas Education Agency (TEA) may reject a quality reviewer applicant if the candidate does not meet minimum eligibility as outlined in this section with approval of the SBOE member for which the applicant is a district resident. The member has one week to respond to TEA's decision. If the SBOE member approves applicants who were previously rejected by TEA, those applications shall be reinstated to the applicant pool to be rated.
 - (3) All eligible quality reviewer applicants shall be evaluated by TEA staff using the applicants' experience and qualifications rated on a scale of 1-3. The best qualified individuals are ranked 1.
 - (4) Once rated, all eligible quality reviewer applicants are shared with the SBOE member for which the applicant is a district resident.
 - (5) TEA staff provides all quality reviewer applicants and their applications to the SBOE member for which the applicant is a district resident, and the SBOE member may adjust rankings, veto applicants, and/or identify top candidates.
 - (6) The SBOE member has two weeks to return applicants and their rankings to TEA staff. If the SBOE member does not submit a response, TEA staff's ranking shall remain unchanged.
 - (7) IMRA quality reviewers must be approved by the SBOE member for which they are a district resident.
 - (8) If an individual invited to serve on a quality review panel declines the invitation, the relevant SBOE member will select an alternate from the list of candidates within one week. To the extent an SBOE member fails to select an alternate within one week, the top-ranked applicant is deemed selected.
 - (9) In the event TEA does not receive enough applications to fill available roles, TEA may:
 - (A) reduce the size of the review team to no fewer than three reviewers;

- (B) postpone the review of materials using the SBOE-approved strategy for prioritizing selection of instructional materials for review; or
 - (C) modify the review schedule to allow for additional recruitment efforts.
 - (10) TEA staff shall build quality review panels using top candidates identified from each SBOE district. As final selections are made, TEA may consider the following characteristics to ensure that each individual review panel is balanced and has the necessary qualifications. The guidelines are established to ensure that the work groups are highly qualified, reflect the make-up of the state's educators, and include representation from the following.
 - (A) Experience: highly qualified educators and others with evidence of strong content knowledge and experience in the subject and/or grade level or bands and/or course(s).
 - (B) Position: a variety of positions reflected such as parents, classroom teachers, campus- and district-level administrators/specialists, education service center subject area personnel, representatives from higher education, and community members, including employers.
 - (C) School district size: large, midsize, and small school districts.
 - (D) Demographics: multiple and different racial and ethnic groups and males and females.
 - (E) School district/charter school: a variety of local education agencies are represented, including open-enrollment charter schools.
 - (F) Expertise: if a work group is assigned a grade band, at least one reviewer with experience teaching for each grade level will be prioritized.
 - (11) TEA staff shall maintain a database of individuals who have served on an IMRA review panel during the review process.
 - (12) Applicants are exempt from subsection (a) of this section if they have previously served as an IMRA quality reviewer and received an acceptable performance rating; however, an SBOE member may waive this provision and require all applicants to resubmit their applications in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.
- (c) Suitability reviewers.
- (1) Texas residency is a minimum requirement for any IMRA suitability reviewer.
 - (2) Each SBOE member shall annually nominate a minimum of 40 ~~[20]~~ applicants to serve as suitability reviewers and rank them from most preferred to least preferred.
 - (3) At least 20% of nominees must be fluent in the Spanish language and ranked separately from most preferred to least preferred.
 - (4) For the review of instructional materials for languages other than English, members must each nominate and rank at least five reviewers fluent in the languages to be reviewed.
 - ~~(5) [(3)]~~ A panel for suitability review consists of three reviewers and shall reflect the political affiliation of the membership of the SBOE. No more than one suitability reviewer per panel may be nominated by [from] any one SBOE member [district] .
 - ~~(6) [(4)]~~ TEA staff shall build suitability review panels using top candidates identified from each SBOE district. As final selections are made, TEA may consider the following characteristics to ensure that each individual review panel is balanced and has the necessary qualifications.
 - (A) Experience: successful participation as a quality or suitability reviewer in a past review.
 - (B) Demographics: multiple and different racial and ethnic groups and males and females.
 - ~~(7) [(5)]~~ If an individual invited to serve on a review panel declines the invitation, TEA will then invite the next eligible reviewer from the SBOE member's list. [the relevant SBOE member will select an alternate from the list of candidates within one week. To the extent a member fails to select an alternate within one week, the top-ranked applicant is deemed selected.]

(8) ~~(6)~~ If there are not enough suitability reviewers available for a review cycle, TEA shall request more nominations from each SBOE member. To the extent a member fails to nominate additional candidates within one week of being notified by TEA , candidates from other SBOE member districts may be considered.

(9) If TEA still requires additional suitability candidates to complete the review after notifying SBOE members of the need for more nominations and fewer than 14 calendar days remain before the review begins, final reviewer selections shall be made in consultation with the SBOE chair to preserve SBOE authority.

(10) ~~(7)~~ If an SBOE member who nominated reviewers no longer holds the office before the start of the annual review, the new SBOE member may nominate different suitability reviewers or adjust their rankings. If the office is vacant, the SBOE chair may nominate different suitability reviewers or adjust their rankings.