			Amplify	
Email Address	**School Site**	**Choice**	**Challenges of Program**	**Strengths of Program**
irlanda.gonzalez@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Third	No lexile, front loading needed	Monitoring work online/instant
lori.thornton@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Second	limited flexibility	simulation were pretty good but were repetitive
ravinderjit.gothra@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Third	organized in 5E format	reading levels
dilpreet.kingra@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Third	Reading level is not at grade level.	Organization
brenda.dizon-harris@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Third	Amplify lacks resources for SPED.	Different labs
blake.burnett@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Second	Time frames given were very slow paced and not realistic. Content was flat and uninteresting. Inaccurate information.	Although the labs were very simplistic and below our students ability and comprehension level, I liked that the lab materials were included.
brian.kitayama@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Second	I disliked the scripted nature of this program.	I liked the grading system.
nishantha.unantenne@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Second	Content and platform is not ready to used in classrooms yet.	It worked on Chromebooks
angel.love-behrens@puhsd.org	CMI	Third	Very confined to just what they give you.	Not much
dana.lane@puhsd.org	CMI	Third	How scripted the program is and how it did not allow for any teacher flexibility in teaching. Many of the lessons were repetitive and the labs did not match the content being taught.	The pictorial visuals at the beginning of the lessons were engaging and exciting for students. They gave the lesson a shock factor.
leona.sibley@puhsd.org	CMI	Third	5Es not always appropriate for use.	Simulations
neal.carmody@puhsd.org	CMI	Second	Too much repetition. In an attempt to look at a similar problem from multiple different angles, Amplify Science did not change the context. As a result the students got extremely sick of the in-class activities, and moaned every time I asked them to pull the program up.	I can't think of any feature in which Amplify was better than Discovery. They did have several good features, but Discovery had these features plus so much more.
elena.nunez@puhsd.org	CMI	Second	The tabs are cluttery, too much back and forth. Not visually attractive to students.	There is an application of knowledge, interactive, teacher can keep tab, rigor.

Discovery Education Science Techbook

Email Address	School Site	Choice	Challenges of Program	Strengths of Program
irlanda.gonzalez@puhsd.org	Pinacate	First	Generating reports and grading; repetitive	Easy organization* students and teacher, CER activities
lori.thornton@puhsd.org	Pinacate	First	I found myself wanting to do all the activities and I probably should have eliminated some	leveled learning, great resources, extended activities for my gate students or my advanced students
ravinderjit.gothra@puhsd.org	Pinacate	First	generating reports and grades	easy organization for both students and teacher
dilpreet.kingra@puhsd.org	Pinacate	First	Assessments.	Lot of Content, Reading level can be differentiated
brenda.dizon-harris@puhsd.org	Pinacate	First	N/A	The reading levels for different students. The abundant resources for reading. Wonderful labs.
blake.burnett@puhsd.org	Pinacate	First	So much to choose from...not really a dislike. I wish I could cover everything.	The vast amount of curricular choices. Very rich, broad, and deep content options and reinforcement. Kid friendly. Students liked the platform. English/Spanish language options, as well as lexile/reading level options.
brian.kitayama@puhsd.org	Pinacate	First	I did not like the grading and assignment portion of this program.	I loved the sheer amount of content included with this program. The lessons also include a large number of opportunities to include literacy lessons while teaching Science.
nishantha.unantenne@puhsd.org	Pinacate	First	Online Program still needs a lot of work. Generating reports is unusable.	Great content - lots of material to pull from.
angel.love-behrens@puhsd.org	CMI	First	Sometimes confusing to find the same thread in the next period.	The depth of resources. Very easy to integrate outside sources into their material. Very flexible.
dana.lane@puhsd.org	CMI	Second	Lesson development was choppy.	The videos elaborated on the content.
leona.sibley@puhsd.org	CMI	Second	Difficult to provide feedback to students.	A lot of content and options to choose.
neal.carmody@puhsd.org	CMI	First	Sometimes it is difficult for the students to find the link to the assessments.	Variety! There are so many resources for different types of content, that it makes it so much easier to plan out effective lessons.
elena.nunez@puhsd.org	CMI	Third	Clutter, videos and lessons are not relevant to the standards. Major parts of lesson not included in the lesson. Too remedial	The visuals in workbook makes it more appealing to the students

STEMScopes				
Email Address	**School Site**	**Choice**	**Challenges of Program**	**Strengths of Program**
irlanda.gonzalez@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Second	Reading level too high	Virtual labs and progression
lori.thornton@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Third	unorganized, more geared to high school, reading level was to high	the labs were fun
ravinderjit.gothra@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Second	Reading levels	progression of the lesson
dilpreet.kingra@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Second	Reading level is not grade appropriate	5 e Lessons, Organized lay out
brenda.dizon-harris@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Second	Lack of differentiated resources.	Wonderful labs.
blake.burnett@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Third	Basic understanding; not a lot of depth and very slow paced. Too many workbooks/worksheets, with students left to make meaning of content. Inaccurate information in some places.	Model lab lesson was well presented.
brian.kitayama@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Third	I did not pilot this program.	I did not pilot this program.
nishantha.unantenne@puhsd.org	Pinacate	Third	Content, assignments, assessments, and activities were mostly unusable. My students hated this curriculum.	?
angel.love-behrens@puhsd.org	CMI	Second	Difficult to utilize quizzes and tests. Difficult to see scores	Format of material. extended sources
dana.lane@puhsd.org	CMI	First	The grading feature was clunky.	Lessons were engaging from start to end. Supplemental materials and kits fit with each lesson smoothly. Had literature and textual reading integrated into each lesson. Labs were engaging. Followed NGSS integration and storyline as outlined by state standards.
leona.sibley@puhsd.org	CMI	First	Reading level is too high for the students.	The program is aligned to NGSS and great labs.
neal.carmody@puhsd.org	CMI	Third	N/A I wasn't here for this pilot.	N/A I wasn't here for this pilot.
elena.nunez@puhsd.org	CMI	First	N/A	N/A not seen it but colleagues expressed their preference to it

Teacher Response Raw Data

Table A: Amplify

Teacher Email	TS 1:	TS 2:	TS 3:	TS 4:	TS 5:	SLE	LMS	Tchr Rating
neal.carmody@puhsd.org	3	4	3	3	4	3	2	3.142857143
lori.thornton@puhsd.org	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1.571428571
ravinderjit.gothra@puhsd.org	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	3
nishantha.unantenne@puhsd.org	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1.857142857
irlanda.gonzalez@puhsd.org	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.428571429
brenda.dizon-harris@puhsd.org	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2.714285714
ravinderjit.gothra@puhsd.org	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
brenda.dizon-harris@puhsd.org	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2.714285714
blake.burnett@puhsd.org	3	3	2	3	3	3	4	3
mitchell.osborn@puhsd.org	3	2	3	4	3	4	4	3.285714286
steven.hoak@puhsd.org	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2.857142857
lisa.tarpley@puhsd.org	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2.571428571
dana.lane@puhsd.org	4	2	3	2	1	2	1	2.142857143
leona.sibley@puhsd.org	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3.714285714
brian.kitayama@puhsd.org	3	3	2	4	3	3		3
dilpreet.kingra@puhsd.org	2	2	2	3	3	2		2.333333333
Average	**2.875**	**2.6875**	**2.625**	**2.6**	**2.875**	**2.8**	**2.5**	**2.708928571**

Table B: Discovery

Teacher Email	TS 1:	TS 2:	TS 3:	TS 4:	TS 5:	SLE	LMS	Tchr rating
neal.carmody@puhsd.org	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	**5**
lori.thornton@puhsd.org	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	**4.714285714**
ravinderjit.gothra@puhsd.org	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	**2.857142857**
nishantha.unantenne@puhsd.org	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	**4**
irlanda.gonzalez@puhsd.org	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**3**
brenda.dizon-harris@puhsd.org	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	**3.285714286**
ravinderjit.gothra@puhsd.org	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	**5**
brenda.dizon-harris@puhsd.org	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	**3**
blake.burnett@puhsd.org	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	**4.714285714**
mitchell.osborn@puhsd.org	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	**4.857142857**
steven.hoak@puhsd.org	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	**2.714285714**
lisa.tarpley@puhsd.org	5	4	4	5	4	5	3	**4.285714286**
dana.lane@puhsd.org	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	**3.571428571**
leona.sibley@puhsd.org	5	4	5	5	4	5	3	**4.428571429**
brian.kitayama@puhsd.org	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	**4**
dilpreet.kingra@puhsd.org	4	3	4	3	2	4	3	**3.285714286**
Question Average	**4.125**	**3.9375**	**3.9375**	**4.1875**	**3.6875**	**3.9375**	**3.625**	**3.919642857**

Table C: STEMScopes

Teacher Email	TS 1:	TS 2:	TS 3:	TS 4:	TS 5:	SLE	LMS	Tchr rating
neal.carmody@puhsd.org	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**3**
lori.thornton@puhsd.org	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	**1.857142857**
ravinderjit.gothra@puhsd.org	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	**4**
nishantha.unantenne@puhsd.org	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**1**
irlanda.gonzalez@puhsd.org	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**1**
brenda.dizon-harris@puhsd.org	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	**2.428571429**
ravinderjit.gothra@puhsd.org	2	4	2	3	2	3	3	**2.714285714**
brenda.dizon-harris@puhsd.org	4	5	5	3	4	5	5	**4.428571429**
blake.burnett@puhsd.org	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	**2.142857143**
mitchell.osborn@puhsd.org	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	**5**
steven.hoak@puhsd.org	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	**2.857142857**
lisa.tarpley@puhsd.org	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	**3.714285714**
dana.lane@puhsd.org	5	5	4	3	2	5	5	**4.142857143**
leona.sibley@puhsd.org	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	**4.285714286**
brian.kitayama@puhsd.org	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	**2.857142857**
dilpreet.kingra@puhsd.org	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	**2.714285714**
Question average	**3**	**3.1875**	**3.1875**	**2.6875**	**2.75**	**3.25**	**3**	**3.008928571**