

Ethnic Studies Curriculum Committee

Findings and Reports

This report was prepared in April 2026 by consultants from the [Social Studies Accelerator](#) (SSA) who were engaged by SFUSD to manage and facilitate the Ethnic Studies Curriculum Committee in partnership with the Office of Curriculum & Instruction. The SSA team also led the pilot data collection (see Review Process Overview section).

Table of Contents

- I. [Vision and Purpose](#)
- II. [Need](#)
- III. [Review Process Overview](#)
- IV. [Curriculum Committee](#)
 - A. [Formation](#)
 - B. [Rubric Development](#)
 - C. [Process](#)
 - D. [Scores and Findings](#)
- V. [Recommendations](#)
- VI. [Appendix](#)
 - A. [Rubric](#)
 - B. [Small Groups Score Summary](#)

Vision and Purpose

San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) is committed to ensuring equitable outcomes for all students. In service of this mission, SFUSD convened a diverse team of teachers, school administrators, family members, and community members to help review and strengthen Ethnic Studies curriculum materials.

Together, the Curriculum Committee examined materials from the Ethnic Studies pilot curriculum (*Voices*) to determine how well they support powerful learning experiences for students—centering multiple perspectives, supporting belonging and identity, and aligning to SFUSD priorities and relevant standards and frameworks—so teachers are equipped to facilitate meaningful, culturally sustaining Ethnic Studies instruction for all SFUSD students for years to come.

SFUSD's Need for Ethnic Studies Curriculum Review

In 2021, California became the first state to establish a statewide Ethnic Studies graduation requirement, supported by the adoption of the California Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum. SFUSD has been at the forefront of this work, offering Ethnic Studies courses and developing a vision for instruction that affirms student identity, centers the experiences of historically marginalized communities, and promotes critical analysis of systems and power.

As SFUSD scales Ethnic Studies instruction across the district, it is essential that the curricular materials teachers use meet a high bar for quality, not only in their alignment to state and district frameworks, but in their ability to support culturally sustaining, inquiry-driven, and literacy-rich instruction for all students. This review process was designed to rigorously evaluate the *Voices* pilot curriculum against those

standards and to provide the Board with an evidence-based assessment to inform its adoption decision.

Review Process Overview

The process of adopting a new Ethnic Studies curriculum started in SY 2024–2025 with a planning process rooted in conversations with principals, teachers, families, and other stakeholders to strengthen SFUSD's Ethnic Studies curriculum and continue to support student outcomes. This planning included developing a multi-year strategic plan for adoption of new curriculum and conducting a comprehensive review of state and national materials to identify a pilot curriculum.

This planning process led to the selection of the *Voices* curriculum to pilot in SY 2025-2026. Throughout the pilot year, SFUSD took several steps to support implementation of the *Voices* curriculum and to continue to understand and evaluate the materials, including:

- **Professional Learning:** PD sessions for both administrators and teachers to support implementation
- **Data Collection:** SFUSD hired SSA to conduct classroom observations, as well as survey and conduct focus groups with students, educators and families to understand how the curriculum is being implemented in classrooms and the reactions from those groups.
- **Audit:** SFUSD hired consultants from WestEd to complete a comprehensive audit of previously used, teacher-generated SFUSD Ethnic Studies resources to identify alignment to standards, strengths, and challenges resulting in a final publicly available report.

The Curriculum Committee evaluation is the final piece of the review process. Based on the full review (data collection, analysis, audit, and curriculum committee evaluation), the Office of Curriculum & Instruction will make a recommendation to

the SFUSD Board to either adopt the *Voices* curriculum in school year 2026-2027 or take a different path.

The Curriculum Committee

SFUSD uses Curriculum Committees as a standard part of its adoption process, having convened them for Mathematics, English Language Arts, and History-Social Studies. For this committee, the role was focused on curriculum quality and usability—specifically, reviewing SFUSD’s Ethnic Studies pilot *Voices* curriculum materials and rating them against the SFUSD rubric. The committee did not debate broader questions of Ethnic Studies policy (e.g., whether the course should be required or the length/structure of the course).

Formation

SFUSD sought to bring together a diverse group of educators, families, and community members to participate in the committee. To recruit participants, SFUSD shared the opportunity through multiple channels:

- **Professional development and teacher communications:** Details were shared at a PD Release Day and in direct communications to Ethnic Studies and high school history/social studies teachers.
- **Staff networks:** The application was distributed through OASIS, SFUSD's internal staff communication platform.
- **Family and community bulletins:** The opportunity was posted in SFUSD's Family Announcement Bulletin.
- **Direct outreach:** Parents, staff, and community members who had previously expressed interest in Ethnic Studies — including those who indicated interest through the Pilot Data Collection survey and those who completed the Ethnic Studies curriculum interest page on the district website — were contacted directly.

Those who were interested were asked to complete a short application which asked about their role in SFUSD (Ethnic Studies teacher, other staff member, parent/caregiver, community member), their experience with Ethnic Studies and curriculum generally, and why they were interested in joining. Every completed application was accepted—no applicants were screened out. SFUSD received 46 applications in total; after confirming the time commitment, some applicants chose not to continue or were not able to attend, resulting in a final committee of 39 members:

- 16 current SFUSD Ethnic Studies teachers
- 5 current SFUSD administrators
- 10 other SFUSD staff members (mix of high school history teachers, other content areas, elementary teachers, and other)
- 8 non-staff members (parents of SFUSD students and/or community members)

It is worth noting that many SFUSD staff members on the committee are themselves parents or caregivers of SFUSD students. While they were selected in their professional capacity and are counted primarily as educators, they also brought firsthand family perspectives to their reviews. The committee's representation of parent and community voice is therefore broader than the formal composition numbers alone suggest.

Rubric Development

The rubric builds on the evaluation framework SFUSD has used for Curriculum Committees in other content areas, including the History-Social Studies materials adoption in 2023. That framework draws heavily on the College, Career and Civics (C3) Framework developed by the National Council for Social Studies, which also informed the California History-Social Science Framework adopted in 2016. Some rubric components, such as literacy development and teacher usability, remain largely consistent with what has been used in prior adoptions, while others were

adapted to reflect the distinct priorities of Ethnic Studies instruction, guided by the California Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum and SFUSD's Ethnic Studies vision.

The rubric was refined in February 2026 to more closely align to the specific needs of Ethnic Studies. These refinements include:

- **Aligning components to Ethnic Studies priorities:** The rubric's components were refined to center the distinct goals of Ethnic Studies instruction. Component 1 (Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks) evaluates how well materials reflect the CA Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum, SFUSD's Ethnic Studies vision, C3-aligned inquiry practices, and the CA History-Social Science Framework and Common Core standards. Component 2 (Culturally Responsive Teaching) includes criteria on identity affirmation, challenging oppressive narratives, and the use of diverse, authentic sources for critical analysis. Across all components, detailed sub-criteria and indicators were drawn from Ethnic Studies-specific language and the CA Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum, including expectations around humanizing instruction, counter-narratives, analysis of power and systems, and identity-affirming pedagogy.
- **Refining the standards-alignment expectations:** Component 1 was designed to evaluate whether materials provide enough clarity in learning goals, skills, and practices that they are readily alignable to the CA History-Social Science Framework and Common Core, rather than requiring that materials explicitly name or cite those frameworks. This distinction recognizes that a strong Ethnic Studies curriculum may demonstrate alignment through its design without always using the same terminology as general social studies standards documents. It also ensured that parents and community members participating in the committee without experience in classroom instruction would not be required to have deep knowledge of these frameworks.
- **Permitting half-point scores:** The scoring scale retained the 0–3 structure used in the History-Social Studies process, but allowed half-point scores (0.5, 1.5,

2.5) to give committee members more precision in distinguishing between adjacent levels of quality.

Process

The Curriculum Committee process included three stages/activities that lead to the scores and findings in this report.

First, the committee attended an in-person session March 14. This session was facilitated by SSA consultants and supported by the History-Social Studies/Ethnic Studies department. The session focused on preparing committee members to score the curriculum. Specific topics covered included: an overview of the *Voices* curriculum - how the materials are organized and the different components provided; a detailed review of the rubric to ensure members understood the criteria, language, and scoring procedures; as well as practice scoring the curriculum and norming across the group.

In the week following the first session, committee members were asked to review the curriculum and give preliminary scores using the rubric. Committee members were asked to review selections from each unit of the curriculum as a minimum, but were free to review additional selections as wanted or needed to accurately score. Committee members were asked to review the teacher editions of the materials so they had insight into both the student-facing materials as well as the supports and resources for teachers.

Finally, committee members attended a second in-person session on March 21. In this session, members worked in small groups. Small groups were composed of no more than four members to keep scoring discussions focused and manageable. Most groups included one family or community member and three SFUSD staff (typically one Ethnic Studies teacher, one administrator, and one other staff member), though the exact configuration varied.. This structure was intentional: distributing non-staff members across groups ensured that family and community perspectives were represented in every discussion rather than concentrated in one or two groups, while

also giving each non-staff member a small-group setting in which their voice could be heard alongside educators with direct classroom experience.

During Session 2, the facilitation guidance emphasized evidence and rubric alignment over scores themselves, and members were asked to lead with their notes and observations from the curriculum materials, grounding the conversation in the rubric's criteria and indicators before turning to numerical ratings.

For each rubric component, groups followed a structured discussion protocol: members shared their evidence and individual scores, discussed areas of agreement and divergence, and worked toward a group consensus score and written consensus statement. Groups were provided strategies for navigating disagreement and building toward shared conclusions. When a group was unable to reach a consensus score, they could instead provide their individual scores, which were averaged to produce the group's score. Similarly, groups were encouraged to develop a consensus statement the full group could stand behind, but where full agreement was not possible, groups could write a primary statement reflecting the majority view alongside a dissenting statement explaining the difference of opinion. Both primary and dissenting statements were expected to remain grounded in the rubric's criteria and cite specific evidence from the materials.

For transparency, this report documents dissenting views where they arose, distinguishing rubric-aligned critiques from broader objections to the curriculum's pedagogical orientation.

Scores and Findings

The scores below are the averages of the small-group scores for each component, with each group's individual scores also included to show the range. The accompanying findings synthesize themes from the groups' consensus statements.

	1. Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks	2. Culturally Responsive Teaching	3. Supports Literacy Development	4. Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability
Average Score	2.57	2.47	2.40	1.64
Range	2.0 - 3.0	1.0 - 3.0	2.0 - 3.0	1.0 - 2.5

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks

Average Score: 2.57 | Range: 2.0 - 3.0

Component 1 received the highest average score across all four components, and no group scored below 2.0. The distribution skews high: three groups scored at 3.0, five scored between 2.5 and 2.75, and three scored between 2.0 and 2.25. This component also surfaced the most prominent individual dissenting views, which are addressed separately below. Notably, the group-level consensus scores remain strong even in groups where dissent was recorded, indicating that the majority view within those groups was consistent with the broader pattern.

Strengths. Across the committee, groups consistently found that the *Voices* curriculum reflects the core aims of the California Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum — educating students about the histories, cultures, and contributions of historically marginalized ethnic and racial groups; developing critical consciousness and an understanding of systems of power; and promoting civic engagement and social responsibility. Multiple groups cited the curriculum's clear learning objectives, its explicit listing of standards and skills at the unit and lesson level, and its alignment to the CA History-Social Science Framework and Common Core ELA/Literacy standards. Groups also highlighted the curriculum's inquiry structures, including compelling and supporting questions that connect historical content to contemporary relevance. Several groups specifically noted that the materials move beyond tokenistic representation, centering the agency, resistance, and resilience of the ethnic groups

the curriculum focuses on, rather than framing their experiences solely through a lens of oppression.

Select quotes from consensus statements:

1. *"The curriculum extensively and authentically reflects Ethnic Studies values and purposes including identity affirmation, humanization, critical consciousness, and community relevance. It thoroughly supports students in analyzing power, systems, and narrative construction, while centering and honoring the histories and experiences of the diverse groups of Ethnic Studies." (Group 7)*
2. *"Standards for civics, history, writing, reading, and listening are explicitly identified for every activity, ensuring a structured approach to learning. The curriculum consistently separates learning objectives into skills and content at the beginning of each unit and defines specific learning goals for every lesson." (Group 5)*
3. *"The book does a great job at identifying deficit framing and common misconceptions to highlight the need to complicate our understanding through the readings. It provides a wide array of different perspectives and stories, even highlighting marginalized communities within a larger diaspora that might often be neglected." (Group 10)*

Areas for growth. The most substantive rubric-aligned critique was that while the curriculum includes compelling and supporting questions and supports inquiry, C3-aligned inquiry practices could be implemented with greater depth. Several groups noted that learning goals are not consistently transparent throughout activities, that opportunities for student-generated questions are limited, and that synthesis tasks could offer a broader range of outputs beyond activism-oriented projects. Groups that raised this theme generally still scored the component at or above 2.5, indicating they viewed it as a refinement rather than a fundamental gap.

Select quotes from consensus statements:

1. *"The curriculum has room for growth in terms of implementing the C3 framework and making learning goals transparent to students and teachers throughout a unit's activities. Opportunities for synthesis and application fall short in deepening learning without requiring 'performative activism.'"* (Group 11)

Scope considerations. Several groups observed that communities beyond the four core identity groups centered in the CA Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum — including Jewish, queer, disabled, and multiracial communities — receive limited coverage. While this reflects the defined scope of the Ethnic Studies framework rather than a misalignment with the rubric's criteria, groups noted it as a consideration for supplementation at the district level.

Dissenting views. In several groups, an individual member described the curriculum as ideologically one-sided or presenting history through a binary "oppressor/oppressed" lens. These views reflect disagreement with the foundational approach of Ethnic Studies as a discipline — its focus on critical consciousness, analysis of power and systems, and the experiences of historically marginalized communities — rather than rubric-based findings that the materials fail to meet the evaluative criteria. This falls outside the scope of the Curriculum Committee's charge, and these perspectives did not shift the consensus score in any group where they were raised.

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching

Average Score: 2.47 | Range: 1.0 - 3.0

Component 2 produced the widest scoring range of any component, though the distribution is somewhat misleading. Ten of 11 groups scored between 2.25 and 3.0, with a median of 2.5 — a relatively tight cluster indicating broad agreement that the curriculum partially to strongly supports culturally responsive teaching. The

single outlier is Group 6, which scored 1.0 based on a rubric-aligned critique that the curriculum does not go far enough in its approach (discussed below). If Group 6 is set aside, the effective range narrows to 2.25–3.0.

Strengths. The most consistent finding across groups was that the curriculum centers the achievements, contributions, agency, and resistance of historically marginalized communities, not solely their experiences of oppression. Groups cited this pattern across units, noting that the materials move beyond well-known historical figures to highlight broader social movements, lesser-known communities, and the wealth of culture and knowledge the groups represented. Nearly every group also noted rich opportunities for students to explore and reflect on their own identities, lived experiences, and worldviews, which is a core aim of culturally responsive teaching.

A second broadly shared strength was the curriculum's use of diverse, authentic sources, including oral histories, creation stories, folk tales, visual art, poetry, film, and first-hand accounts. Together, they support critical analysis of narrative, power, and lived experience. Multiple groups noted that sources are varied enough to invite questioning and critique of dominant narratives, and that students are prompted to reflect on their own biases and build empathy through structured activities.

Select quotes from consensus statements:

1. "Voices consistently and thoroughly centers the achievements, contributions, strengths, skills, and knowledge of historically marginalized people and communities. Counter-narratives are centered that critically examine dominant perspectives, power structures, and ideological assumptions.... Sources are varied and even contradictory, inviting students to question and critique dominant narratives across past and present contexts." (*Group 7*)
2. "The materials successfully center marginalized voices and challenge dominant narratives by utilizing primary sources and oral histories, specifically highlighting Yoruba creation stories, Indigenous sovereignty and sacred sites, and narratives of Asian immigrant resilience." (*Group 5*)

3. "The textbook utilizes and synthesizes the concept of oppressive narratives vs. counter-narratives by revealing the media's power of presenting stereotypes and perpetuating tropes. It continues by critiquing some media and even celebrating media sources that reflect the voices, cultures, and lived experiences of the people represented." (*Group 10*)

Areas for growth. The most widely shared rubric-aligned critique was that the curriculum provides limited opportunities for students to explore connections across communities, including cross-racial solidarity, multiracial and multiethnic identities, and allyship. The *Voices* curriculum is organized by unit around individual identity groups, and while groups generally agreed that the curriculum does strong work within each, multiple groups noted it does not consistently support students in understanding how those experiences intersect. Relatedly, several groups observed that the curriculum assumes students arrive with knowledge of dominant narratives but does not always provide those narratives as a foundation for counter-analysis, and that frameworks introduced early in the curriculum are not carried through consistently across later units.

Select quotes from consensus statements:

1. "Opportunities to explore cross-racial solidarity, multiracial and multiethnic identities, and collaboration across groups are limited. Some units present cultural groups in ways that do not fully reflect internal diversity or contemporary perspectives." (*Group 4*)
2. "The overall purpose of Ethnic Studies is to amplify the experiences of marginalized groups to offer a counter-argument in history, but we feel like the *Voices* curriculum does not provide examples of the dominant narrative that our students can examine so they can offer a counter-narrative." (*Group 2*)

Group 6 (score: 1.0). Group 6's score is a significant outlier but merits separate discussion because their critique is rubric-aligned. They argued the curriculum does not go far enough in meeting the standards for culturally responsive teaching. They

identified specific instances where they believed the text minimizes histories of oppression or frames communities primarily through a lens of victimhood rather than centering the cultural strength and agency the rubric calls for. While no other group scored this component below 2.25, several of Group 6's underlying concerns — particularly around intersectionality and the need for deeper critical engagement — echo themes raised at a less pointed level by other groups.

Individual dissenting views. Individual dissents were recorded in four groups (consistent with the dissenting committee members for Component 1). The dissenting perspectives argued that the curriculum presents a one-sided narrative, does not foster genuine critical thinking, and creates division among students. These views are not grounded in the rubric's criteria for Component 2, which evaluate whether the curriculum affirms learner identities, challenges oppressive narratives by centering the agency of marginalized communities, and incorporates diverse and authentic sources. As in Component 1, these perspectives did not shift the consensus score in any group where they were raised.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development

Average Score: 2.40 | Range: 2.0 - 3.0

Component 3 produced the narrowest scoring range of any component. Six of 11 groups scored at 2.5 or above. The remaining five scored between 2.0 and 2.33. No group scored below 2.0. The overall distribution suggests broad agreement that the curriculum partially to strongly supports literacy development, with most discussion centering on the degree of that support rather than whether it exists.

Strengths. The most consistent finding across groups was that the curriculum provides a wide variety of materials and source types, including primary and secondary written texts, images, art, maps, poetry, video, oral histories, and data. The Committee found that the curriculum uses these intentionally to build

comprehension and analytical skills. Nearly every group cited this as a core strength. Groups also noted a clear pattern of embedded reading comprehension strategies (annotation, structured note-taking, graphic organizers, rhetorical analysis) and regular opportunities for evidence-based writing across multiple formats, from reflective journaling to academic essays with source-based argumentation.

Select quotes from consensus statements:

1. "The units and lessons demonstrate the consistent presence of instructional strategies that support students in their development of academic literacy. This is supported by a pattern of developmentally-appropriate comprehension, discussion, and writing prompts that call on students to reference and build from texts in their writing, reading, listening, and speaking development." (*Group 7*)
2. "Across units, students use a range of literacy strategies (including annotation, rhetorical analysis, structured note-taking, vocabulary development, summarizing, and analysis of author purpose and bias) to build comprehension and interpretation of texts." (*Group 4*)
3. "Students are provided with space to engage in opinion-based discourse that connects to culturally relevant materials, allowing them to explore their unique experiences in developing their opinions in relation to the content." (*Group 8*)

Areas for growth. Multiple groups identified a pattern of vocabulary and text complexity that may exceed what 9th-grade students can access without additional support. Key terms are introduced but not always consistently defined, scaffolded, or revisited across units. Several groups also noted that while the curriculum provides comprehension tools (e.g., graphic organizers, discussion prompts), it does not consistently offer teacher guidance on how to build routines around those tools or facilitate structured academic discourse, leaving implementation quality dependent on individual teacher capacity.

Select quotes from consensus statements:

1. "The curriculum does not provide teachers with tools to help students formulate their own critical thinking questions nor does it provide instructions on how to facilitate structured class discussions that allow students to practice using academic language and encourage diverse opinions." (*Group 2*)
2. "There is limited connection across reading strategies and intended literacy skills... Academic discourse is not centered as a teaching practice." (*Group 11*)

Dissenting views. There were not any noteworthy dissents recorded for this component. Two groups noted they did not reach full consensus, but in both cases scores fell within a narrow range and the differences were ones of degree rather than direction.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability

Average Score: 1.64 | Range: 1.0 - 2.5

Component 4 received the lowest average score of any component and represented the area where the committee saw the most room for improvement. The distribution shows two clusters: four groups scored at or near 1.0 (limited presence) and two groups scored at 1.5, while four scored near 2.0 (partially embodied) and one at 2.5. Despite this spread, every group (including those that scored higher) identified notable gaps in similar areas. The variation in scores reflects less a disagreement about what's missing than a difference in how much weight groups gave to the structural strengths that are present.

Strengths. Groups broadly acknowledged that the curriculum's organization and formatting are consistent and navigable. Units follow a predictable structure, with clearly labeled sections, learning objectives, key terms, and recurring lesson features.

Multiple groups also noted the presence of some differentiation tools: graphic organizers, structured note-taking strategies, editable slides, and occasional leveled suggestions for "advanced" and "approaching" learners. Several groups cited the variety of assessment formats (writing prompts, short answer, document-based questions, self-assessments) as a strength.

Select quotes from consensus statements:

1. "The text provides regular, easy-to-implement materials and assessments. This is supported by evidence including graphic organizers for writing and processing, UDL strategies implemented in lessons, and editable slides. The materials are organized consistently across units and lessons, making it easy to navigate for instructors." (*Group 9*)
2. "There is a consistent pattern of 'EL Tips' and 'ELL Adaptations' and 'Differentiation' suggestions for teachers that guide adapting the lessons and materials for ELL students and students with learning needs. The tips are consistent across the text and easily accessible to teachers." (*Group 7*)
3. "The curriculum does provide a variety of assessments, including writing prompts, multiple choice, self-assessments, short answers, document-based questions, free response questions, and accommodated assessments." (*Group 1*)

Areas for growth. The most pervasive finding, cited by virtually every group, was that supports for Multilingual Learners, English Language Learners, and Newcomer students are not enough. Groups described ELL scaffolds as too general or consisting primarily of reduced workload rather than meaningful language supports, noting the absence of sentence frames, language objectives tied to CA ELD standards, home language resources, and differentiated text by reading level.

A closely related theme was that the curriculum places a disproportionate burden on teachers to create scaffolds and adaptations for diverse learners — including chunked texts, guided notes, modeled examples, and supports for students with IEPs

or 504 plans. Several groups observed that the differentiation strategies that do exist tend to lower cognitive expectations rather than scaffolding students toward grade-level work.

Finally, multiple groups flagged usability issues in the teacher-facing resources, including some broken hyperlinks, materials gated behind paywalls, and graphic organizers referenced but not linked at the point of use.

Select quotes from consensus statements:

1. "Resources and suggestions for Multilingual learners are lacking and in need of improvement. The materials are missing essential scaffolds for vocabulary, sentence frames, visuals, annotated texts, and home language resources."
(Group 9)
2. "Teachers must do a lot of work in the area of differentiation, as Voices does not have differentiated levels of text, academic language supports and sentence frames, and chunked or shortened texts. Teachers have to create these." (Group 7)
3. "The current state of the materials places an undue burden on instructors. To ensure equitable access, teachers must extensively adapt content using tools to adjust Lexile levels and create supplemental supports not provided by the publisher." (Group 5)

Dissenting views. No individual dissents were recorded for this component. One member in Group 5 abstained from scoring, citing a lack of specialized expertise in this area and deferring to the group's collective judgment.

Overall Evaluation Committee Findings

Based on the committee's evaluation and review, the following findings are offered.

1. The committee's evaluation found that the *Voices* curriculum meets the standards for high-quality Ethnic Studies curriculum across the rubric's four components.

2. Based on the committee's evaluation, priority areas for professional learning include; support for Multilingual Learners and students with IEPs (Component 4), improving the consistency of vocabulary scaffolding and teacher facilitation guidance across units (Components 3 and 4), and ensuring that terminology throughout the text is accurate, contextualized, and aligned to current scholarship (Components 1 and 2).

3. Continue developing locally relevant content to deepen student engagement. Several groups noted the curriculum's strength in connecting historical content to contemporary relevance and students' lived experiences — and the pilot data collection provides further insight into how students respond to that connection. It is recommended to continue to develop supplemental content that centers Bay Area and California communities, histories, and contemporary issues, building on the curriculum's existing framework while deepening its local resonance. This includes incorporating local legislation, community histories, and place-based examples that connect the curriculum's broader themes to the specific communities SFUSD students come from.

Appendix

Appendix A: Rubric

1. Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks

Curriculum is aligned to relevant state and district frameworks for Ethnic Studies and is designed as coherent, meaningful learning progressions. Materials make learning goals transparent and include structures that promote inquiry, critical thinking, and evidence-based understanding.

CRITERIA

INDICATORS (Examples include, but not are limited to)

1A. Aligned to the CA Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum (Principles & Guidance) Curriculum reflects the aims and approaches of the CA Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum, including humanizing instruction, critical analysis, and multiple narratives that center the voices and experiences of historically marginalized communities.	• Reflects Ethnic Studies values and purposes (identity affirmation, humanization, critical consciousness, community relevance) in unit and lesson design. • Avoids common misalignments such as tokenism, “heroes and holidays” treatment, or deficit framing • Supports students in analyzing power, systems, and narrative construction in developmentally appropriate ways.
1B. Aligned to SFUSD Core Values Curriculum reflects SFUSD core values in its content, design, and approach.	• Materials center students’ identities, experiences, needs, and opportunities to learn. • Materials respect and help students understand diverse people, perspectives, and communities. • Materials support critical engagement with injustice and encourage constructive collaboration across differences.
1C. Promotes Inquiry, Evidence, and Critical Thinking (C3-aligned practices, as applicable) Curriculum includes structures that reflect strong social studies practice—using compelling/supporting questions, working with evidence, and applying learning to real-world contexts in appropriate ways. (Adapted from C3 Dimensions 1–4)	• Uses compelling and supporting questions at the unit/chapter/section level to organize learning and connect to contemporary relevance. • Prompts students to evaluate sources and evidence and build evidence-based understandings (as developmentally appropriate). • Includes opportunities for synthesis/application (e.g., reflection, dialogue, civic/community connections) that deepen learning without requiring performative “activism.”
1D. Aligned to the CA History–Social Science Framework and Common Core (as applicable) Curriculum provides enough clarity (learning goals, skills, practices, and tasks) to support alignment to the CA History–Social Science Framework and Common Core ELA/Literacy expectations in history/social studies. Materials are readily mappable to expectations.	• Units/lessons clearly communicate learning goals and social-studies disciplinary practices (e.g., analyzing sources/evidence, constructing claims, interpretation). • Content/skills progress in developmentally appropriate ways that align with how historical thinking and inquiry skills are typically sequenced. • Reading, discussion, and writing tasks reflect Common Core-aligned literacy in history/social studies (e.g., evidence-based writing/discussion, working with complex texts/sources).

2. Culturally Responsive Teaching

The curriculum supports instruction that connects to the experiences and learning processes familiar to historically marginalized students. It centers multiple narratives and prompts critical investigation so students can see themselves, understand others, and analyze the forces shaping their world.

CRITERIA	INDICATORS (Examples include, but not are limited to)
2A. Affirms and Nurtures Learner Identities and Knowledge of Self Curriculum provides authentic, developmentally appropriate opportunities for students to reflect on identity and worldview, deepening understanding of both self and others.	• Provides structured opportunities for students to explore and reflect on their identities, lived experiences, and worldviews. • Engages students in perspective-taking that fosters empathy and understanding across diverse backgrounds, cultures, and contexts.
2B. Challenges Oppressive Narratives Curriculum supports students in identifying and critiquing dominant narratives and ideologies, while centering the agency, complexity, and contributions of historically marginalized people and communities.	• Centers the achievements, contributions, strengths, skills, and knowledge of historically marginalized people and communities. • Provides counter-narratives that critically examine dominant perspectives, power structures, and ideological assumptions.
2C. Uses Diverse, Authentic Sources to Support Critical Analysis Curriculum incorporates accurate, authentic sources from diverse authors and creators that represent multiple perspectives and support students in analyzing narrative, power, and lived experience.	• Presents multiple perspectives on shared events and experiences, including those of historically marginalized people and communities. • Centers primary and secondary sources that authentically reflect the voices, cultures, and lived experiences of the people represented. • Selects sources that invite questioning and critique of dominant narratives across past and present contexts, with text complexity appropriate to the grade level.

3. Supports Literacy Development

Curricular materials support students in understanding and analyzing a variety of texts in building reading comprehension skills, in finding and producing textual evidence to support their responses, acquiring content-specific vocabulary, and participating in academic discourse and writing.

CRITERIA	INDICATORS (Examples include, but not are limited to)
----------	---

3A. Develops Reading Comprehension Skills Curriculum supports students in building reading comprehension.	• Students are asked developmentally appropriate questions that broaden and solidify understanding and interpretation of text. • Provides reading objectives aligned to grade-appropriate Common Core Social Studies aligned Reading Standards.
3B. Includes Evidence-Based Discussion and Writing Curriculum provides opportunities for students to engage in academic discourse and produce writing grounded in evidence from texts and sources, as developmentally appropriate.	• Includes discussion prompts that foster in-depth, grade-level academic discourse grounded in textual and source-based evidence. • Engages students in writing tasks connected to texts that require reasoning supported by evidence, including drawing and dictation in early grades. • Provides writing prompts that support text-based analysis, interpretation, and synthesis of sources. • Aligns discussion objectives and prompts with grade-level Common Core Speaking and Listening standards for history/social studies. • Aligns writing objectives and tasks with grade-level Common Core Writing standards.
3C. Builds Textual Analysis Skills Using Different Types of Texts Curriculum supports students in developing textual analysis skills by engaging with multiple types of texts and sources (e.g., written, visual, audio, quantitative), enabling interpretation, comparison, and evaluation of meaning and perspective across formats.	• Includes multiple types of texts and sources (e.g., primary and secondary written texts, images/art, maps, graphs/data, video/audio, oral histories). • Prompts students to analyze, interpret, and evaluate meaning, perspective, and bias across different text types. • Uses varied text types intentionally to build comprehension and analytical skills, rather than as enrichment or optional extensions. • Supports students in drawing connections across formats, comparing perspectives, and synthesizing information to construct evidence-based understanding.

4. Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability

Curriculum provides regular, easy-to-implement materials and assessments, along with scaffolds and other supports, to ensure all students can access and engage in grade-level learning. Learning exceptionalities include, but are not limited to SpEd, Newcomer, Multilingual learners, and students who need more of a challenge.

CRITERIA	INDICATORS (Examples include, but not are limited to)
----------	---

4A. Provides Supports for a Variety of Learners (UDL-Aligned) Curriculum includes Universal Design for Learning (UDL)-aligned scaffolds and differentiation to ensure that students with diverse learning needs—including Multilingual Learners, students with IEPs/504 plans, and students needing additional challenge—can access and engage in grade-level learning.	• Embeds UDL-aligned supports consistently across units and lessons, incorporating multiple means of engagement, representation, and action/expression. • Provides accessible supports for Multilingual Learners (MLLs/ELs), such as language objectives, vocabulary scaffolds, sentence frames, visuals, structured talk, and home language resources where available. • Includes scaffolds and differentiation in both teacher-facing and student-facing materials, e.g., graphic organizers, chunked or shortened texts, guided notes, modeled examples, alternative response modes, and extension options. • Addresses reading level and text complexity through supports such as annotated texts, vocabulary previews, alternate text versions where available, and guidance for adjusting complexity to meet learner needs.
4B. Materials are Accessible, Well-Organized, and Easy to Navigate Materials are designed in an accessible, clearly structured format so teachers and students can quickly find what they need and implement lessons effectively. Materials are organized and presented in ways that support consistent use across classrooms.	• Materials are logically organized (e.g., by unit and lesson) and clearly labeled with consistent naming conventions. • Navigation is intuitive across formats (digital and/or print), including links, tables of contents, and clear file or folder structures. • Uses consistent templates and formatting (e.g., lesson structure, headings, icons/labels) that make materials easy to scan and implement. • Key teacher and student materials are easy to locate at the point of use, including lessons, assessments, handouts, and slides. • Materials are usable as provided, requiring minimal extra formatting, and are editable when adaptations are needed.

Appendix B: Small Group Scores Summary

Group	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4
1	2.25	2.25	2.50	1.50
2	2.75	2.88	2.13	1.00

3	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.00
4	2.25	2.25	2.50	1.00
5	3.00	2.50	3.00	1.00
6	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.50
7	2.50	2.83	2.67	2.50
8	3.00	2.50	2.50	2.17
9	2.50	2.50	2.25	2.00
10	3.00	3.00	2.33	2.17
11	2.50	3.00	2.00	1.17
Average	2.57	2.47	2.40	1.64

Appendix C: Small Group Consensus Statements

The following statements were written by each small group during Session 2 and are presented with only minor formatting edits. Where a group did not reach consensus, the statement reflects the range of views within the group.

Group 1

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (2.25)

We did not reach a consensus. Three members found that it aligned with the C3 Framework (less so with inquiry) and with reading and writing standards from the Common Core and reading for literacy within social studies. Three members found that the inclusion of literary luminaries and content often left out of other classes was a strength. Additionally, it includes a significant amount of modern events. One member found that *Voices* emphasizes Model Curriculum Standard 4 more than others, at the expense of 2 and 6; that it was not aligned with being student-centered and promoting critical thinking (focus on one type of activism); emphasis on oppressed vs. oppressor but less on what comes next; want broader range of changemakers; doesn't include positives of colonialism; serious concerns about Unit 1 being irresponsible.

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (2.25)

We did not reach a consensus. Three members found that it countered dominant narrative through discussing diversity within groups and examining marginalized groups through a humanizing lens. The literary luminaries, visual art, poetry, etc. incorporate a diverse range of expressions from a wide range of peoples. The opportunities afforded through extension recommendations for readings, etc. allow for even more voices. One member had concerns about how the text is framed and how everything is filtered through oppressor/oppressed language (victimhood) and does not feel it fosters critical thinking. The text flattens ethnic groups, notably framing Jews in the white demographic, which erases Jewish diversity and peoplehood.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (2.50)

Our group scored this component a 2.5 because the materials provide structures for students to read a wide variety of text using comprehension strategies. This is supported by evidence noted in graphic organizers, although the blank graphic organizers are not as helpful without prompts and scaffolds. There were also a wide variety of types of writing, such as informative, research papers, and personal reflection; however, when it got to the more technical writing and approach, the guidance for the teacher was lacking. There is an abundance of tools and suggestions to the teacher in regards to comprehension, but there isn't guidance on how to build in routines and repetition of the same structures for students.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (1.50)

This component received a score of 1.5, reflecting that the curriculum does provide a variety of assessments, including writing prompts, multiple choice, self-assessments, short answers, document-based questions, free response questions, and accommodated assessments. While there are some scaffolds in place for differentiation, the actual differentiation in place is limited. Scaffolds and supports for English language learners offer little guidance, mostly suggestions around decreasing the workload or having students work together in a group. There is no reference to the California English Language Development standards, no meaningful structures that teach language functions or ways of interacting with the text. In regards to the accessibility and ease of navigation of the text, there are consistent formats in place. Each section provides comprehension skills, key terms, learning objectives, and writing opportunities at the end of the section.

Group 2

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (2.75)

Our group scored this a 2.5. It was clear to our group that the *Voices* curriculum aligns with Common Core standards as well as the Social C3 Framework, evident by the alignments listed on the prereading before every unit. Upon further examination, we were able to see all of the Ethnic Studies Model Framework demonstrated, especially when we consider that there are common openings to bring in world views, reflect on bias, critique structures, policies, and impact on communities, followed by a look into activism, resistance, and resilience. There is clear evidence of the text prompting students to think critically about difficult concepts such as cultural appropriation and white privilege. The reason why we took off 0.5 of a point is because we did not think the text completely aligned with one of the SFUSD core values that asks for curriculum to provide materials that support critical engagement with injustice and encourage constructive collaboration across differences. While we agreed that there were many perspectives provided, some of us think that there are missing perspectives. For example, one section about highlighting luminaries highlighted one side of the African American experience without providing a counter that shows how other African American authors have written about their experience of US history.

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (2.88)

Our group scored this 2.87. In terms of affirming and nurturing learner experiences, we discussed that the overall purpose of Ethnic Studies is to amplify the experiences of marginalized groups to offer a counter argument in history, but we feel like the *Voices* curriculum does not provide examples of the dominant narrative that our students can examine so they can offer a counter narrative. In addition, the *Voices* curriculum covers the historically marginalized groups in the US but does not address groups that are currently marginalized such as Somalians, Palestinians, etc. We also appreciated that the *Voices* curriculum incorporated folk tales and short stories from various cultures as well as achievements of several members of each ethnic group. When we looked at 2B (Challenges Oppressive Narratives), we found that every unit ends with each group's activism and contribution to larger movements that challenged oppressive narratives. For example, Unit 4, Lesson 4 talks about Latino activism, clearly showing Latino resistance and resilience. Another example is on p. 130, where the text talked about the slave trade AND discussed maroon settlements as well as the experience of the Gullah people, which offers a different perspective on the experience of enslaved African Americans. While our group commends *Voices'* plethora of diverse sources and perspectives, we would like to note that there is an opportunity to include local

legislation, reaction, and perspectives to specifically address the inequities in education in California that highlight the positive responses to the activism of people of color to reflect the change that has happened.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (2.13)

Our group scored a 2. The *Voices* text offers a pattern of comprehension strategies such as Cornell note-taking, KWL charts, and T-charts to encourage students to organize their thinking as they read. In addition, the text also offers a large variety of texts and sources with different types of media in a predictable pattern: creation myth, arts, luminaries that provide students with different access points to content and concepts. Furthermore, the curriculum asks students to evaluate different sources like maps, short stories, political cartoons, and images from different historical archives. One point of weakness that we identified as a group is the limitations of the text in prompting students to formulate questions to promote student-driven deeper critical thinking and allow for more diverse perspectives. We did not see evidence of teacher guidance for depth of discussion and writing. While there were writing and discussion prompts, the curriculum does not provide teachers with tools to help students formulate their own critical thinking questions nor does it provide instructions on how to facilitate structured class discussions that allow students to practice using academic language and encourage diverse opinions. We wish there were better tie-ins to the essential questions throughout the units. It is worth noting that the text offers rhetorical analysis activities across units; however, it does not provide teachers strategies to help students build toward having said rhetorical discussion using academic language, key terms, and what they learned from the text.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (1.00)

Our group scored a 1. There were a lot of different media provided that gave students different entry points, but we felt that the curriculum lowered expectations for folks who were not at grade level. In addition, we saw limited differentiation for appropriate reading levels. For example, one differentiation strategy on p. 213 asked approaching learners to simply put flags on the text. Another critique that we had was that there is limited evidence of scaffolding for vocabulary and language support and how to access challenging text, not to mention that all additional text recommendations are above 12th grade reading level. For example, the book asks teachers to "chunk" text without providing instructions on how to do that. There are also no strategies provided for how to read, such as how to annotate. Even more concerning is that we did not see much support for students with IEPs that are related to literacy — this is really important especially for

new teachers who may not know how to differentiate or accommodate for different students with IEPs yet. In terms of teacher accessibility, we saw evidence of teacher resources; however, they were not very easy to navigate. It did not offer enough guidance for teachers to implement the resources and hyperlinks were broken or restricted by paywalls. We also want to note that there is limited support for student collaboration, including how we can turn reading into a group activity to encourage community and skill building.

Group 3

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (2.50)

We did not come to consensus. The average score is 2.25. Most members saw evidence that the standards were met. The materials provided aligned with CA, SFUSD, and Ethnic Studies standards. Some strengths in the curriculum were reflected in the varied resources, primary sources, and student assessments. Some patterns we noticed were that skills were scaffolded well from unit to unit and the culminating assessments allowed students to practice historical thinking and critical analysis.

Dissent: The original framework for ES wasn't focused on how to be an activist. The focus was supposed to be on "appreciation for the contributions of multiple cultures" (California, AB 2016). The pattern, however, as can be seen by the table of contents, is to glorify activism instead of an emphasis on an appreciation for different cultures. Also, the curriculum omits meaningful inclusion of Jewish Americans, Muslim Americans, and LGBTQ+ communities, even though the Model Curriculum states that Ethnic Studies courses include how these groups contributed to American society, and the courses will address the causes of racism, anti-Indigeneity, xenophobia, antisemitism, and Islamophobia. The brief mention of Muslims, Jews, and the LGBTQ+ communities is a form of tokenism, not aligned to State Standards and Frameworks.

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (2.50)

We did not come to consensus. The average score was 2.5. Most of the group found that the materials presented centered student experiences, cultural capital, and other forms of institutional knowledge. The emphasis on oral traditions, art, music, film, and diverse literary luminaries allow students many points of engagement. The achievements and acts of resistance that are

highlighted provide counter narratives that allow students to analyze power, dominant perspectives, and ideological assumptions.

Dissent: Worse than an omission of multiple narratives prompting critical investigation, the textbook presents one-sided points of view that create division among the classroom. From a legal perspective, this differential treatment may contribute to a hostile environment if it results in the minimization or dismissal of a protected group's experiences. Such an outcome could implicate Title VI and related state protections.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (2.50)

We were unable to get to consensus. The average score is 2.5. There are patterns of evidence in terms of providing support for literacy through the textbook. Each unit begins with suggested sources with varying text types and levels of difficulty. This will allow teachers to help students build comprehension. There is also support for developing academic vocabulary; for example, the key terms for each lesson are listed at the beginning and highlighted when they show up in the text. There is also "The Word" pop-out box which details the origins of the word. The assessments also allow students to demonstrate understanding through writing in different formats — journaling, poetry, summary paragraph, academic essay.

Dissent: By having college-level theoretical language in the ninth grade, the evidence for grade-level content is limited without the proper supports. Though supports exist, there's not enough evidence that the textbook provides developmentally appropriate questions. The writing exercises are based on ideological positioning instead of the rubric's requirement of producing writing grounded in evidence.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (2.00)

The consensus score is 2. Materials are accessible and well organized but leave a big burden on the teacher to develop scaffolds for ML and differently abled students. Some materials show evidence of UDL — for example, the art analysis and emphasis on storytelling. There is also differentiation for advanced learners and approaching learners. Overall, there is some evidence of UDL but not all the time.

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (2.25)

The curriculum demonstrates strong alignment to state and district frameworks for Ethnic Studies and is designed as a coherent and meaningful learning progression. It reflects the aims and approaches of the California Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum by centering identity affirmation and providing consistent opportunities for students to connect content to their own identities, experiences, and communities (1A, 1B). Across units, the curriculum supports the development of critical consciousness by engaging students in analysis of power, systems, and the construction of narratives, including examining how groups are labeled, represented, and at times erased in dominant historical accounts.

The curriculum moves beyond tokenistic representations by centering the experiences and contributions of historically marginalized communities and providing opportunities for students to consider multiple perspectives and work across differences (1A, 1B). Instruction is organized around compelling and supporting questions that promote inquiry-based learning and connect to contemporary relevance, such as examining the evolution of race and ethnicity or identifying the presence and contributions of different groups within students' communities (1C). The curriculum also demonstrates interdisciplinary connections, including links to geography and economics, and incorporates literacy practices aligned to Common Core expectations in history/social studies (1D).

At the same time, one group member raised concerns that the curriculum consistently presents activism as the only means for ethnic groups to find identity and advance as people. Diverse perspectives are erased, and deficit framing is often used. White supremacy is presented as "distinctly American" and wealthy immigrants are labeled "whiter." Critical analysis is not encouraged as the book only presents one interpretation — that of seeing the world through oppression and marginalization.

Overall, the committee found that the curriculum aligns strongly to the Ethnic Studies framework and rubric indicators, while noting that greater emphasis on nuance and opportunities for students to independently evaluate a broader range of perspectives could further strengthen alignment.

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (2.25)

Our group scored this indicator a 2.25 because it demonstrates strong alignment to culturally responsive teaching by centering multiple narratives and providing opportunities for students to engage with the lived experiences and perspectives of historically marginalized communities. Across units, students engage with firsthand accounts, primary sources, and cultural texts such as

creation stories and fables, which support analysis of perspective, power, and lived experience. The curriculum moves beyond a focus on well-known historical figures by highlighting lesser-known groups and emphasizing broader social movements and their contributions.

The curriculum also supports students in challenging dominant narratives and examining power structures and ideological assumptions. Students are prompted to reflect on their own biases and worldviews, learn about the experiences of others, and make connections between these perspectives. These opportunities support identity reflection and perspective-taking across diverse backgrounds.

At the same time, the committee identified limitations in how the curriculum supports understanding across differences. Opportunities to explore cross-racial solidarity, multiracial and multiethnic identities, and collaboration across groups are limited. Some units present cultural groups in ways that do not fully reflect internal diversity or contemporary perspectives. In some cases, activities may not fully support nuanced understanding across diverse backgrounds. Another observation to note is that it is on the onus of the teacher to bring in secondary sources to supplement the textbook; what is present in the textbook is mostly secondary narration. Overall, the curriculum demonstrates strong alignment to culturally responsive teaching, while additional attention to complexity and connections across groups could further strengthen its impact.

One group member's dissenting perspective: The text fails to critically examine its own ideological assumptions and oversimplifies history by interpreting it through a binary lens of victim/oppressor. Instruction segregates students into marginalized or complicit categories, which fails to foster empathy and understanding across diverse backgrounds. The majority of authors and historical figures are activists, teaching a single ideological perspective while erasing those who are perceived to be "working within the system."

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (2.50)

Our group scored this component a 2.5 because the curriculum demonstrates strong alignment to the literacy indicators through consistent opportunities for students to engage in reading, discussion, and writing grounded in evidence. Across units, students use a range of literacy strategies (including annotation, rhetorical analysis, structured note-taking, vocabulary development, summarizing, and analysis of author purpose and bias) to build comprehension and interpretation of texts (primary, secondary, art, photos, graphs, charts, maps, videos, fiction, and non-fiction text). The curriculum also provides structured opportunities for students to engage in academic discourse and produce writing informed by textual and source-based evidence, with

routines that support discussion before and after reading and writing tasks. In addition, students engage with a variety of text types, including primary and secondary sources, images, and multimedia, and are prompted to analyze perspectives and sources across formats.

However, some texts and disciplinary vocabulary are not consistently defined, broken down, or contextualized and may require more supports for student understanding. Some text complexity may exceed grade-level expectations (such as the recommended readings by unit — the first unit was particularly concerning at 12+), which could limit accessibility for some students and unevenly support literacy development.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (1.00)

Our group scored this component a 1 because the curriculum demonstrates partial alignment to this indicator. Materials are clearly organized with consistent unit and lesson structures, and include some structured routines and opportunities for differentiation, such as choice in student products and occasional supports for advanced learners.

However, supports for a variety of learners are not consistently embedded across units and lessons. Scaffolds aligned to Universal Design for Learning (like language objectives, sentence frames, and other structured supports for Multilingual Learners) are limited. Scaffolding is often inconsistent or implied rather than systematically woven into the curriculum. The materials include heavy academic vocabulary and complex texts without built-in differentiation, and assume background knowledge and reading stamina. There are no chunked or shortened texts, summaries, guided notes, or modeled examples, and supports for students with IEPs/504 plans, Newcomer students, and Multilingual Learners are not clearly accounted for. ELL supports are infrequent and too general to be effectively applied. Resources in teacher tools are provided, such as graphic organizers for analyzing pictures, maps, and writing, but are not usable as provided.

Teacher usability is also uneven (while resources are provided in the teacher tools, having them hyperlinked to the lesson would make them more accessible). While materials follow a consistent structure, they are not usable as provided and require significant teacher modification to meet the needs of diverse learners. Resources such as graphic organizers are not easy to navigate, and some materials are not accessible without technology.

Additionally, materials are only available in English, with no translation options or accessibility features for visual or other learning needs.

As a result, equitable access to grade-level learning is not consistently ensured, and implementation depends heavily on teacher capacity to adapt materials.

Group 5

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (3.00)

Our group assigned this component a score of 3, as the materials demonstrate a high level of organization, thematic depth, and clear alignment with the California History–Social Science Framework and Common Core State Standards (CCSS). As evidenced in Section 3B, standards for civics, history, writing, reading, and listening are explicitly identified for every activity, ensuring a structured approach to learning. This technical alignment is paired with rigorous primary source work, including the analysis of Jim Crow era oral histories (p. 156) and Great Migration map analysis (pp. 164–165). A notable strength is the unit's connection to the 13th Amendment (p. 155), which serves as a vital bridge to civic understanding. Furthermore, the curriculum consistently separates learning objectives into skills and content at the beginning of each unit (p. 57) and defines specific learning goals for every lesson (p. 60). Beyond technical metrics, the lessons deeply reflect SFUSD values of fearlessness and diversity by humanizing the Black American and Indigenous experiences and engaging in conversation about difficulty. Rather than centering solely on themes of oppression, the materials pivot toward narratives of resistance, resilience, and agency. For example, the curriculum addresses how contemporary issues dehumanize Indigenous communities, such as the Dakota Access Pipeline (p. 113), while affirming the need for critical consciousness and cultural preservation (p. 115). Diversity-driven content helps students explain contemporary issues within Indigenous communities (pp. 69–71) through the review of primary source stories (pp. 58–59). Students are frequently prompted to think critically about terminology (p. 62, "Consider This") and reflect on prior knowledge to foster a more comprehensive and humanized historical consciousness. A committee community member shared their perspective of it being biased toward political beliefs; however, the other three educator members felt it was based in facts, aligned to standards, and not biased.

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (2.50)

Our group assigned a score of 2.5 because the materials consistently address the core tenets of Culturally Responsive Teaching throughout Units 1–5, though a decrease in depth and support was identified in the final unit. The curriculum provides robust opportunities for students to explore their own identities and understand others, beginning with the foundational framework in Unit 1 (p. 21) and continuing with relatable content for multilingual learners, such as articles on code-switching and comparisons of global school norms. Critical thinking is encouraged through metacognitive prompts that ask students to identify their own biases and preferences as they read. Furthermore, the materials successfully center marginalized voices and challenge dominant narratives by utilizing primary sources and oral histories, specifically highlighting Yoruba creation stories (pp. 126–127), Indigenous sovereignty and sacred sites (pp. 114–116), and narratives of Asian immigrant resilience (p. 277). While the first five units prioritize humanizing history through themes of agency, such as HBCUs and grassroots Chinese labor activism, Unit 6 shifts toward a more traditional, fact-based chronological approach that lacks diverse perspectives. This final unit also presents a significant gap in teacher guidance for navigating sensitive contemporary issues; for example, the discussion on Black Lives Matter (p. 351) lacks the necessary Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) framework to support students through potentially triggering content. Ultimately, while the curriculum provides a strong base for challenging oppressive narratives, the depth of this responsiveness relies heavily on the individual teacher's ability to bridge the text with the specific needs of their local community and contemporary issues. One member of our team felt this threatened the identities of white students, whereas another member of the team disagreed.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (3.00)

Our group assigned a score of 3 to this component, as the materials consistently provide reading objectives aligned with grade-appropriate Common Core Social Studies standards. This alignment is clearly evidenced by the standards outlined at the beginning of each unit and specific learning objectives introduced at the start of every lesson. Furthermore, the curriculum intentionally utilizes a diverse range of text types, including poetry, digital media, novels, and both primary and secondary sources, to cultivate robust comprehension and analytical skills. The instructional design effectively integrates visual and organizational tools such as maps, graphic organizers, and Venn diagrams to support student understanding. For instance, pp. 129 and 149 feature meta-class activities that explicitly model reading strategies for the whole group, followed by direct instruction on the Cornell note-taking system. Vocabulary development is equally prioritized; on p. 199, a specialized word web activity allows students to trace the etymology and historical development of key terms. Finally, the curriculum emphasizes evidence-based writing, as seen on p. 320, where

students are guided to synthesize information and cite credible sources within an academic essay rooted in personal reflection, and supports students in drawing connections across perspectives.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (1.00)

For purposes of transparency, it is noted that one team member abstained from direct scoring due to a self-identified lack of specialized expertise in this specific component. This member deferred to the collective judgment of the group, which arrived at this consensus following a rigorous review of the evidence. The evaluation team has assigned a score of 1 for this component. The primary justification is a fundamental lack of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) alignment, though there are clear efforts to provide some level of support for learning differences. The materials fail to provide consistent scaffolds or differentiation necessary to support diverse learner populations, including Multilingual Learners (MLs), students with IEPs/504 plans, and those requiring advanced academic challenges. There is a significant deficit in EL accommodations. Cooperative learning structures frequently assume high English proficiency or require same-language partners to be effective. The curriculum lacks simplified text versions and visual vocabulary supports (e.g., pictorial representations of key terms). High-level conceptual vocabulary, such as "bias" and "identity," is introduced without the requisite instructional strategies to bridge student understanding. While Units 2 and 6 exhibit some multi-access designs (including three-level differentiation and structured talk), this quality is not maintained. Units 1, 4, and 5 lack essential language frames and often resort to reducing cognitive expectations rather than providing the support necessary to meet them. The current state of the materials places an undue burden on instructors. To ensure equitable access, teachers must extensively adapt content using tools to adjust Lexile levels and create supplemental supports not provided by the publisher. There is a specific concern regarding the impact on Newcomer students. Encountering culturally relevant content that remains linguistically inaccessible can lead to frustration and a heightened stress response, potentially hindering the learning environment for up to three hours following the session. The materials oscillate between inclusive designs and high-effort, work-intensive units. The lack of teacher guidance for complex tasks, such as rhetorical analysis and source evaluation, results in a curriculum that offers only minimal or weak support for the learners who need it most.

Group 6

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (2.00)

We rated this a 2. There is alignment to state standards with clear essential questions with reflection questions (examples p. 57, EQ, p. 71). In terms of SFUSD and Ethnic Studies standards, we notice patterns of still perpetuating a status quo narrative of history. SFUSD social justice/diversity values are not thoroughly represented in a "fearless" way, which is problematic because the purpose of Ethnic Studies is to uplift the voices of communities who have been marginalized. There is a total lack of precolonial history, which would not center students' identities or avoid common misalignments such as deficit framing. Huge inaccuracies in the terminologies used to refer to these groups (i.e., Latino rather than Latinx/Latine, using the slur "coolie" to refer to Chinese immigrant laborers, using the terms "Mulatto," "Negro," "Indio" without describing how these are slurs, pp. 205, iii, 274). Lack of analysis of power. Patterns of tokenization (i.e., pictures of Che Guevara and Pancho Villa without any context or description in the text, pp. 245, 241). Lack of perspectives and erasure of queer, disabled people, women, Asian people outside of East Asia. The pattern we noticed is that yes, the activities and lessons do align with the state standards and frameworks, but there is exclusion of queer communities (i.e., in "Latino" descriptor on p. iii). There are also some inaccuracies that we observed that do not align with helping students understand diverse communities (e.g., misnomer of Jewish as a race rather than ethnicity, p. 12).

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (1.00)

We rated this section a 1 because it is not sufficient in challenging oppressive narratives both in content and practice for students. Overall the patterns we noticed were that there was a lack of culturally responsive teaching. Lack of intersectionality makes it difficult for students to understand solidarity between various identities. There were also inaccuracies and misstatements that were not humanizing — i.e., referring to Jim Crow as "a century of challenge" (p. 148) and sanitizing US imperialism and power dynamics in histories of oppression (the Philippine-American War section sanitizes the role of US aggression and broken treaties with Filipino allies, erases Filipino resistance, and calls civilian deaths "indirect war consequences" when in reality US generals ordered troops to "kill everyone over the age of 10," p. 278). Another pattern was lack of a contextual foundation, which made secondary and primary sources difficult to interpret for students. There were some opportunities for self-reflection (p. 56), but not peer/group reflections that would build students' empathy or models to help students feel safe. The historiographical choice of starting each unit with colonization fails to teach students about the cultural strength and beauty of each group, placing them in a perpetual victim narrative. The complexity of precolonial histories and our achievements and contributions were erased in this curriculum.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (2.00)

We are aligned on a 2 because the text includes academically appropriate discussion and writing tasks, and a variety of sources (examples: pp. 15, 71–72, 128, 149–155, 194, 256, 361). The drawbacks were that some of those supplementary sources are not within the main text. You can find these literacy texts in the first part of each unit on the lettered pages (i.e., 1A–1J) — but students would not have access to these literacy texts, only the teacher at their own discretion. There is no support for students drawing connections across the formats. We believe that there should be more specificity in support for some of the literacy development skills.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (1.50)

We aligned on a 1.5 score, due to the fact that this section does not properly support ELL or Multilingual learners. Some themes we notice are that the offered supports were not descriptive or were overly generic (pp. 59, 113, 340). There were vocab banks but often they had inaccessible definitions (pp. 208, 339). There is consistency in formatting but generally speaking not sufficient support for asking students to demonstrate their learning other than in discussion and writing. From an EL perspective the content is difficult to access and lacking supports — for example, home language resources, frames, listening options, outside community support for ELL options. Some organizers were embedded in the text but not catered to students who would most need them, and there was no way to copy and paste into language translators (p. 112). In terms of special education needs, activities are lacking variety for students who may learn in hands-on formats or formats other than speaking/writing. Lack of opportunities for teachers to include culturally responsive supports for students (i.e., community resources).

Group 7

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (2.50)

Our group has scored this component 2.5 because the materials are aligned to state standards and frameworks, specifically the CA Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum, SFUSD Core Values, the CA History-Social Science Framework and Common Core ELA/Literacy Standards, and promote inquiry, evidence, and critical thinking, with a limitation in the inclusion of certain specific marginalized groups. The curriculum extensively and authentically reflects Ethnic Studies values and purposes

including identity affirmation, humanization, critical consciousness, and community relevance. It thoroughly supports students in analyzing power, systems, and narrative construction, while centering and honoring the histories and experiences of the diverse groups of Ethnic Studies. There is a strong presence of humanizing content and instructional strategies that engage students with the material from a positive and affirming perspective; joy, empathy, and cultural wealth are centered, and a high value is placed on precolonial ancestral knowledge in all units. The materials prompt students to evaluate sources and evidence and build evidence-based understandings, and include extensive opportunities for synthesis and application in discussion prompts throughout. The historical narratives and content thoroughly reflect the California History and Social Science Framework. Reading, writing, and discussion tasks well reflect California Common Core State Standards in humanities. However, groups that face structural discrimination but aren't part of the four included groups are given very brief coverage, even though they are present in both California and SFUSD. One example is Jewish history and experiences, as they are only included very briefly on a few pages, giving a very limited and incomplete look.

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (2.83)

Our group has scored this component a 2.83 because the materials connect to the experiences and learning processes familiar to historically marginalized students, centering a multiplicity of texts, narratives, and prompts that promote critical investigation for students to build empathy with other students and position themselves in their own learning. *Voices* consistently and thoroughly centers the achievements, contributions, strengths, skills, and knowledge of historically marginalized people and communities. Counter-narratives are centered that critically examine dominant perspectives, power structures, and ideological assumptions; additionally, it presents multiple perspectives on shared events and experiences of historically marginalized people and communities. The book, as a comprehensive secondary source, authentically reflects the voices, cultures, and lived experiences of the people represented, as do the primary sources included and referenced. Each lesson includes extensive additional sources that speak to and deeply cover the broad, diverse experiences of our students. Sources are varied and even contradictory, inviting students to question and critique dominant narratives across past and present contexts, with text complexity appropriate to the grade level. Students are able to use the materials to formulate their own rich and in-depth text-based arguments. Students connect the past to today. While we ranked this criterion close to a 3, we noted key limitations. A more in-depth look at other ethnic groups that have migrated to the US is needed (Irish, Italians, Eastern Europeans, especially Jewish people) to be more culturally responsive, as it provides all students structured opportunities to explore and

reflect on their identities, lived experiences, and worldviews. It would foster better inclusion and empathy for all students. In centering the achievements, contributions, strengths, skills, and knowledge, there is a focus on activism while not centering these additional areas like science and athletics that students could use to build knowledge and empathy.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (2.67)

Our group scored this component a 2.67 because the units and lessons demonstrate the consistent presence of instructional strategies that support students in their development of academic literacy. This is supported by a pattern of developmentally appropriate comprehension, discussion, and writing prompts that call on students to reference and build from texts in their writing, reading, listening, and speaking development. Students are led to connect texts to other texts in ways that broaden and build on their social studies learning and knowledge. Reading, writing, and discussion objectives and tasks are aligned to 9th-grade California Common Core ELA Literacy standards, and include a multiplicity of types of texts and sources; each unit includes a variety of secondary-source text formats such as short bios, longer conceptual breakdowns, narratives of history, maps, art pieces, images — and connect to video and documentary texts in the online edition. Writing tasks engage students in connecting to texts that require reasoning supported by evidence (CER Paragraph format), which support text-based analysis, interpretation, and synthesis of sources. This score reflects a pattern of key limitations in the content that might inhibit literacy development: for example, key vocabulary might be college-level, dense, and advanced for 9th grade vocabulary development — the text is inconsistent in this key literacy area. In this key area, the scaffolds necessary for vocabulary development would need to be created by teachers. Overall, our group feels that *Voices* does support literacy development, and that teachers and the district will need to build supports for students in areas of literacy work and acquisition where *Voices* is not as strong as it could be.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (2.50)

Our group scored this component a 2.5 because the materials provide equitable access and teacher usability with some limitations. This is supported by evidence of content and strategies that incorporate multiple means of expression, engagement, and representation for diverse learners. There is a consistent pattern of "EL Tips" and "ELL Adaptations" and "Differentiation" suggestions

for teachers that guide adapting the lessons and materials for ELL students and students with learning needs. The tips are consistent across the text and easily accessible to teachers. Graphic organizers, note-taking strategies, and additional texts are available for teachers to use with students. Model examples of student work are provided for teachers. Additionally, teachers have extensive lesson-extension options. Our score reflects areas where the curriculum falls short: the adaptation and modification suggestions are very brief and limited in scope. Teachers must do a lot of work in the area of differentiation, as *Voices* does not have differentiated levels of text (by Lexile score), academic language supports and sentence frames, and chunked or shortened texts. Teachers have to create these.

Group 8

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (3.00)

This component received a score of 3, reflecting that the curriculum does reflect Ethnic Studies values and purposes, humanization, critical consciousness, and community relevance. This is supported by evidence comparing the points of view of two or more authors on how they treat similar topics, including which details they include and emphasize in their respective accounts. It also does well in not tokenizing individual leaders and in including Claudette Colvin's counter-narrative to the dominant narrative of Rosa Parks. While materials align with a singular identity, they lack inclusion of multi-ethnic/cultural/racial identities and the nuances of those identities. There are several opportunities across units for synthesis through reflection, dialogue, and civic/community connections, without resorting to performative activism.

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (2.50)

This component received a 2.5 due to the extensive opportunities for students to engage, explore, and reflect on their identities, lived experiences, and overall scope of the world. The units did offer space for critiquing dominant narratives as it relates to marginalized communities. We felt it lacked depth in certain areas when it came to cultural awareness, namely the lack of multicultural solidarity, queerness, Southwest Asian and North African communities, and mixed-race identities. In addition, it lacked the opportunity to reflect on allyship between white communities and communities of color. We explore the creation of whiteness, but not the role of white people in dismantling white supremacy and varying forms of oppression. The 4 I's of Oppression (p. 40) is a

great framework for educating students on how to engage with various forms of oppression, how they intersect, and how they show up in society. What was missing was the continuation of this tool across units to encourage this critical reflection among our students.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (2.50)

Our group scored this component 2.5 because the materials demonstrate access to note-taking strategies to support comprehension, in addition to the inclusion of varied formats from text, visuals, videos, etc., for many entry points for varied-level learners. We all agree that unit guiding questions are age-appropriate for 9th grade. The formal writing tasks require students to support ideas with text-based analysis, interpretation, and synthesis of sources, which includes drawing connections across formats. More importantly, students are provided with space to engage in opinion-based discourse that connects to culturally relevant materials, allowing them to explore their unique experiences in developing their opinions in relation to the content. The Literary Luminaries allows teachers to include non-historical texts to further explore multiple perspectives and experiences, which allows students to receive information on sensitive topics in an accessible way and creates a safe, healing-centered learning environment where students co-create a space to discuss harmful/sensitive/lived realities. However, the curriculum lacks teacher aids to support students with language objectives and acquisition, particularly for ELL students, and Newcomer students are not included. While definitions of Key Terms are available, the use or revision of said Key Terms is not explicitly included throughout the units. Additionally, accommodations for students with IEPs are not visible throughout the units. Differentiation Bubbles often suggest grouping in which advanced learners can do most of the work on their own, whereas approaching learners depend on teacher support. Lastly, there is no clear guidance for teachers on facilitating safe conversations around sensitive topics, nor are there any next steps for addressing harm.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (2.17)

Our group scored this component a 2.17 because the earlier units provide several entry points with UDL-aligned supports, whereas later units offer fewer supports, requiring the teacher to find supplemental materials or resources. The printed textbooks lack support for addressing reading levels and for providing alternative text versions for ELLs, Newcomer students, students with varied reading levels, and students with IEPs and 504 plans. While some reading segments are small, there is no opportunity for teachers to chunk longer reading materials. While materials are logically organized and clearly labeled, the online teacher guide lacks hyperlinks to graphic organizers and student-facing materials, and the printed version lacks examples of student-facing

graphic organizers for each student learning checkpoint. Additionally, there are limited ways for students to demonstrate learning, with writing leaning heavily. The committee noted that there are explicit learning goals and framing that enable students to closely read and document evidence rather than opinion. This is evident on p. 339, during the framing of inequalities, which asks students to offer an explanation based on the text.

Group 9

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (2.50)

The majority of the group scored this a 3 because of their perspective that the materials demonstrate structures and content that promote inquiry, critical thinking, and evidence-based understanding. This is supported by a pattern of diverse representation amongst identity groups and discussion of counter-narratives and critical perspectives. Additionally, the content is well aligned with C3 standards, CA History-Social Science Framework, and Common Core standards. Content avoids common misalignments like tokenism, deficit framing, and performative "activism."

Another member of the group scored this a 1 because of their opinion that the materials lack opportunity for critical thinking and flatten the perspectives of some identities. This member thinks the content is misleading and performative and that the curriculum is in need of more positive representations of certain identities.

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (2.50)

Our group scored this a 2.5 because the materials support instruction that connects to the experiences and learning processes familiar to historically marginalized students. This is supported by evidence including a pattern of structured opportunities for students to explore and reflect on their identities, lived experiences, and worldviews. We also feel there are many examples of lessons and activities that engage students in perspective-taking and fostering empathy while also building critical historical analysis skills through discussing shared events and experiences. Content also centers the achievements of marginalized peoples and provides counter-narratives. The included primary and secondary sources authentically reflect marginalized voices and experiences. Members of the group also noted that the text makes assumptions about students' understanding or prior knowledge of dominant narratives and that the text should take care to include additional counter-narratives of included events.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (2.25)

Our group scored this a 2.25 because the materials demonstrate multiple opportunities for students to advance their literacy development. This is supported by evidence including patterns of building reading comprehension through a variety of techniques, academically rigorous key terms and definitions, and multiple opportunities for students to engage in academic discourse and writing. We also feel there are multiple opportunities for multimodal texts like videos, interactive websites, art, maps, graphs/data, and primary and secondary sources. Learning goals include standards and skills like analyzing, summarizing, and making students' own conclusions. Members of the group also noted that some sections' writing tasks are stronger than others, but the unit assessments are consistently well designed. The text makes assumptions about students' prior understanding of historical contexts, which opens opportunities for potential misunderstandings without teacher supplementing of the curriculum to access students' background knowledge.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (2.00)

Our group scored this a 2 because the text provides regular, easy-to-implement materials and assessments. This is supported by evidence including graphic organizers for writing and processing, UDL strategies implemented in lessons, and editable slides. The materials are organized consistently across units and lessons, making it easy to navigate for instructors. We also feel there are very strong resources present in the teacher guide. Members of the group are in agreement that the resources and suggestions for Multilingual Learners are lacking and in need of improvement. The materials are missing essential scaffolds for vocabulary, sentence frames, visuals, annotated texts, and home language resources. Because of the combination of strengths and shortcomings, we have concluded on a score of 2.

Group 10

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (3.00)

This component received a score of 3, reflecting that it meets the criteria set forth by the rubric. The textbook consistently lists summaries of standards/indicators in context of each section/activity, along with a list of online resources/websites at the beginning of each section. It also provides opportunities for scaffolded inquiry tasks (questions to get students to talk about

topics such as race). Also, it does a good job in providing intersectionality, a myriad of identities, perspectives, and in general, providing humanizing content and materials which meet the criteria set by the ES curriculum guidelines. It also represents SFUSD's core values (social justice, diversity, fearless, etc.) through the covering of topics centering the experiences of marginalized communities, which also are consistent with the criteria set by the CA History-Social Science Framework. The book also does a great job at identifying indicated deficit framing and common misconceptions/stereotypes to highlight the need to complicate our understanding through the readings. Additionally, it provides a wide array of different perspectives and stories, even highlighting marginalized communities within a larger diaspora that might often be neglected. There are also patterns of constructive collaboration with questions to ask for discussions, along with a building of skills in ways that feel developmentally appropriate.

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (3.00)

Voices utilizes the concept of intersectionality to explore and reflect students' identities and lived experiences. The concept of intersectionality gives students an opportunity to foster empathy and understanding across diverse backgrounds, cultures, and contexts. Another strength is the utilization of oral histories for students themselves and resourcing information from their classmates and family members. There were overarching concepts such as economic inequality (redlining and housing discrimination) which reveal the shared experiences across multiple marginalized groups that still affect people today. The textbook utilizes and synthesizes the concept of oppressive narratives vs. counter-narratives by revealing the media's power of presenting stereotypes and perpetuating tropes. It continues by critiquing some media and even celebrating media sources that reflect the voices, cultures, and lived experiences of the people represented.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (2.33)

Our group scored this component a 2.33. The textbook provides a list of key terms, essential questions, and reading comprehension strategies, along with consistently synthesizing content to support student understanding and comprehension. Additionally, the textbook provides a wide variety of texts (art, poetry, reading excerpts, maps, data charts, etc.) while asking students to complete a variety of tasks to show comprehension such as art analysis, research questions, discussions, etc. It also provides some opportunity to have discussion-based questions using evidence and sources. On the other hand, the textbook

falls short on providing appropriate scaffolding for diverse readers' needs that reflect our student demographics. It could also use more formative assessments beyond mere research, which is a common activity throughout the textbook. Literacy comprehension is partially embodied throughout the units, but at times feels superficial for both student and teacher.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (2.17)

Our group scored this component a 2.17. There is ample evidence of the textbook being well organized, using consistent formatting and templates to help both students and teachers. This helps with being able to decipher the content for students, while helping teachers complete tasks/activities such as color-coded notes, annotations, and other assessments. This includes structured talks in pairs and whole group discussion. While the materials provide a list of ELL and SPED tools to help specific demographics, it feels minimal at best and needs a more robust development to feel more authentic. Additionally, the book skews heavier on more advanced readers versus newcomer students, for example, which can limit the ability to provide supports for a variety of learners.

Group 11

Component 1: Aligned to State Standards and Frameworks (2.50)

Our group scored Alignment to State Standards and Frameworks a 2.5 because the curriculum adheres to state standards and SFUSD's core values, but the C3-aligned practices could be done with more integrity. The curriculum aligns with the Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum, state standards, and Common Core standards as evidenced by the Lesson Features before each unit. Although those standards are clearly outlined, the curriculum has room for growth in terms of implementing the C3 Framework and making learning goals transparent to students and teachers throughout a unit's activities. Opportunities for synthesis and application fall short in deepening learning without requiring "performative activism."

Component 2: Culturally Responsive Teaching (3.00)

Our group scored Culturally Responsive Teaching a 3 due to the curriculum's attention to learner identities, counter-narratives, and diverse sources. Throughout the text, students are asked to reflect in "What Do You Think?" sections and are prompted to consider others' worldviews through activities and questions. The curriculum balances oppression and resistance, dedicating lessons to both themes in each unit. It centers achievements and contributions of marginalized peoples in the "Consider This," "Connect It," and "Spotlight" sections of the textbook. Students can critically analyze multiple perspectives because there are many sources that reflect the voices, cultures, and lived experiences of people represented. There are a lot of counter-narratives, but the dominant narrative is not always clear or interrogated. The curriculum would benefit from more primary sources, as well as more opportunities for sources to present multiple perspectives on shared events and experiences to further challenge oppressive narratives.

Component 3: Supports Literacy Development (2.00)

Our group scored Literacy Development a 2 because although the curriculum provides reading objectives and multiple texts and opportunities for writing, there is limited connection across reading strategies and intended literacy skills. There are developmentally appropriate comprehension questions and reading objectives throughout the text. The writing prompts in the online assessment guide support text-based analysis, interpretation, and synthesis of sources. Throughout the textbook, multiple types of texts and sources supplement the curriculum. The "Consider This" questions are in-depth discussion prompts, but academic discourse is not centered as a teaching practice. There is a lack of purpose in analyzing, interpreting, and evaluating meaning, perspective, and bias across the provided text types. It does not support students in drawing connections across formats in an explicit and intentional manner.

Component 4: Provides Equitable Access and Teacher Usability (1.17)

Our group scored Equitable Access and Usability a 1.17 because although we believe the materials are easy to navigate and are accessible to teachers, the curriculum does not support a variety of learners and would require extensive adaptations and formatting needed for all students to succeed. Materials are logically organized and clearly labeled. There is a consistent format in the presentation of the text and lesson features. There are multiple types of activities for writing and discussion such as map and art analysis. Supports for Multilingual Learners lack accessibility, such as sentence frames/starters, vocabulary scaffolds, and explanations that link content vocabulary to the overall themes of the text. MLL support primarily falls to pairing with other students for activities, but there are no clear adaptations for reading. The scaffolds do not intentionally lead to

an objective at the end of lessons or units. Project-based learning is intertwined with UDL implementation and is lacking in this curriculum. There are example activities that could be projects, but we believe this curriculum needs more scaffolding for a UDL-aligned curriculum to support all learners.