



**EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS  
APPROVAL COMMITTEE  
(EMAC)**

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION & CULTURE  
TANZANIA

Manual of Procedures August 1999

VOLUME 1

## CONTENTS

1. Objectives
  2. Transparency and Confidentiality
  3. Camera-Ready Copy (CRC)
  4. Evaluators
  5. Evaluation criteria
    - 5.1. Course books
    - 5.2. Technical criteria
    - 5.3. Supplementary materials
    - 5.4. Reference materials
    - 5.5. Non-textual materials
  6. The approval process
    - 6.1 Secretariat
    - 6.2 Registration and coding
    - 6.3 Evaluation
    - 6.4 Report to EMAC
    - 6.5 EMAC meeting
    - 6.6 Types of approval
    - 6.7 Appeals
  - 7 Fees
- 
- |         |   |  |
|---------|---|--|
| Annexes | 1 | Evaluation sheet for Course books        |
|         | 2 | Evaluation sheet for Supplementary books |
|         | 3 | Evaluation sheet for Reference books     |
|         | 5 | Summary sheet for evaluation             |
|         | 4 | Technical evaluation sheet               |
- 
- VOLUME 2  
Coding system for CRC received (only for EMAC Chairman and Secretariat)
- 
- VOLUME 3  
Approval of non-textual materials (to be planned)

## Abbreviations

BMU	Book Management Unit, MOEC
B:P Ratio	Book:Pupil Ratio
CRC	Camera-Ready Copy
DEO	District Education Office
ECU	Education Co-ordination Unit, PMO
EMAC	Educational Materials Approval Committee
GOT	Government of Tanzania
MOEC	Ministry of Education and Culture
ms	manuscript (Pl. mss)
PMO	Prime Minister's Office

The following terms are used in this document according to the accompanying definitions:

Course Book	A book intended to be used by all pupils in the class and to cover the entire syllabus for one year or part of one year of study. Ideal B:P Ratio 1:1. Should be accompanied by a Teachers' Guide.
Pupils' book	A Course Book or Supplementary Book intended for pupils use.
Reference Book	A book intended as a source of information, some of which may not be specific to a particular subject or grade (includes atlases, dictionaries and other non-fiction materials).
Supplementary Book	A book intended to be used by all pupils in the class to supplement the Course Book. It may or may not cover the entire syllabus for the year. B:P ratio may vary. It may be accompanied by a Teachers' Guide.
Supplementary reader	A storybook (novel, short stories, etc.) intended to promote reading skills. May be fiction or non-fiction.
Teachers' Guide	A book providing assistance and guidance to teachers on how to use the accompanying Pupils' book.
Work	General term for a book (in manuscript, CRC or printed form) whose title has not yet been decided or which is not disclosed.

## 1. Objectives

In the new multi-textbook educational environment, an approval system is needed to assist teachers and other education professionals to select books, by guaranteeing the objectivity, correctness and relevance of the material.

The new approval system is designed and created to improve the quality of education in general by enabling MOEC to:

- ◇ first evaluate, and then approve, propose changes or reject educational materials intended for school use, using recognised experts' advice under open and transparent criteria;
- ◇ improve the quality, relevance and suitability of educational materials;
- ◇ enhance the use of quality educational materials;
- ◇ assist publishers to provide relevant, high quality educational books
- ◇ improve teachers' performance and confidence;
- ◇ improve learning efficiency and effectiveness.

There are great differences in the costs and duration of different textbook evaluation methods: summative evaluation can provide excellent, in-depth feedback, but is both time-consuming and expensive, generally requiring the printing of large numbers of trialling materials. Because of constraints on both time and financial resources, the EMAC will apply a system of formative evaluation.

All titles and series, which are approved, will be included on the national Approved List of Educational Materials, which will be copied to DEOs, schools and other educational establishments. Books should be approved for use in schools for a fixed period (6 years) and would be allowed to bear a statement from the MOEC to that effect (e.g., "Approved by the Educational Materials Approval Committee for use in schools under the *Kiswahili* syllabus, (*year*) as a *Kiswahili* Course book for a period of six (6) years from .....").

During that period, selected teachers would be solicited by the EMAC for comments on the book after using it in the classroom. The comments would be passed to the publisher for consideration and incorporation into the series in later editions. Towards the end of the six-year period, the publisher will be expected to submit a revised edition to the EMAC which could grant approval for a further five-year period if the series is still suitable.

As well as fulfilling the MOEC's wish to apply principles of good governance, the heavy investment that the development of a new textbook title represents also translates into a strong demand for transparency. The criteria on which the approval decision is based should be public, and formulated so that they facilitate an objective evaluation. Indeed this Manual of Procedures (Volume 1) should be published as a public document and made available to all publishers, authors and other interested parties.

## 2. Transparency and confidentiality

There are two essential prerequisites for a successful approval system - transparency and confidentiality. While these appear to be in conflict with each other, they are, in fact, complimentary and provide the approval process with properties that the users can trust and be confident in.

Transparency is required so that publishers and authors can feel confident that their manuscripts (and the heavy investments already made in them) will be treated fairly, without bias and according to criteria and procedures, which are in the public domain. Similarly, EMAC and the evaluators must feel confident that their evaluations and decisions will be received as the objective results of professionally performed analyses, with as little room for subjective value judgements as possible.

Confidentiality is required so that the creative and financial investments of authors and publishers are protected during the approval process, and to protect the evaluators and EMAC from potential coercion or other unfair practices, either intentional or unintentional.

The approval process, therefore, is designed to safeguard and enhance these qualities of transparency and confidentiality. When a title is received by the EMAC Registrar, it will receive a Code Reference Number, by which it will be referred to in all internal EMAC procedures. Only the Registrar will be able to match the Code with the submitting publisher, so evaluators will not know the names of either the publisher or the authors of the title.

The coding system is prepared as a separate document (Volume 2), and will be available only to the EMAC Chairman and the Secretariat.

## 3. Camera-Ready Copy (CRC)

An ideal situation from an evaluator's point of view would be to receive a printed book for evaluation, as all factors are then completely finalised, including the technical specifications. However, from the publisher's point of view this would be extremely wasteful if the book were to be rejected or to require some changes before approval. It would also be wasteful from the point of view of the education system, as the professional inputs of the evaluators could not be put to full use in improving the quality of the book.

The optimum compromise is for evaluators to receive the CRC version of the book, with illustrations in place. Thus all the textual contents, layout, format and illustrations have been finalised, so the evaluation can consider all aspects of the book apart from the technical specifications.

However, there are several requirements for the CRC version:

- ◇ double-page spreads - CRC must be presented as final spreads in order for the evaluator to see how the opposing pages are balanced;
- ◇ illustrations in place - all illustrations (line drawings, photographs, maps, charts etc.) must be final, cropped, magnified/reduced and with an

indication of colour usage to allow the evaluator to determine the quality, relevance and correctness of the illustrations.

Publishers who have already a title in print may submit the printed version after removing the cover and any prelims, which would identify the publisher or author(s).

#### **4. Evaluators**

Evaluators must be selected on the basis of their educational and professional qualifications and experience. While it may not be necessary to hold a doctorate in chemistry in order to evaluate a primary science book, the higher the grade the greater the complexity of the subject matter and the deeper the knowledge required by the evaluator, so a sound background in the subject is needed. However, subject specialists must also have some experience of teaching at the level for which the book is intended, otherwise the evaluation becomes purely academic. For example, a Kiswahili specialist from the Faculty of Education is almost certainly better equipped to evaluate language books than a member of the Faculty of Kiswahili or from BAKITA but who has no formal pedagogical background.

Ideally, if three evaluators are to be used for each title, at least one should be an experienced teacher of the grade and subject under review: the other evaluators should be either a subject expert or a teacher trainer or a curriculum expert.

All evaluators should receive some training before they begin their work. This training should be an introduction to the new procedures and criteria, using the actual evaluation forms as a basis. The need for objectivity, consistency and speed should be stressed. It is also important to emphasise that the job of the evaluator is to determine only whether the book is suitable for the purpose it is intended. It is essential that evaluators understand there are often alternative methodologies, approaches, etc. to a particular concept or body of knowledge. If the approach differs from what the evaluator would himself or herself recommend, but is still suitable and correct, the evaluator must approve it (possibly pointing out to the publisher/author the alternative approach and its advantages - see below, Section 6.6).

Above all, the evaluators must show a high degree of professionalism and integrity. The registration and coding system will ensure that the identity of the publisher and author(s) will remain secret, and will protect the evaluators to a large extent from outside influence and coercion, as well as from claims of unfair prejudice. However, should the identity of the publisher or author become known by accident, the evaluator must disregard it. Similarly, should any evaluator be approached in any way regarding a particular title (apart from by the EMAC Secretariat), details of this approach should be conveyed immediately to the Chairman of EMAC. If a single evaluator is perceived to

be less than scrupulously fair and trustworthy, the entire approval system can be laid open to doubt and mistrust.

## 5. Evaluation criteria

An approval system is needed to assist teachers and other education professionals in book selection, by guaranteeing the objectivity, correctness and relevance of the material. The criteria on which the approval decision is based should be public and formulated so that they facilitate an objective evaluation.

The proposed approval system uses criteria that can be objectively evaluated and is intended to guarantee a basic standard of quality (i.e. that the book is not harmful or misleading and that it reflects Tanzania's educational aims). Questions of pedagogical quality, degree of suitability of language, quality of presentation is highly subjective and should be treated as part of the advisory function of the EMAC. These questions should be primarily the responsibility of the publisher (who is trying to achieve highest quality) and the purchasers (who will decide which of the alternatives is the "best" one for their purposes). However, evaluators should also comment on them, too.

Approval of learning materials should guarantee that they meet the following demands:

(i) *Correspondence with the Syllabus and Curriculum*

Approval guarantees that the content of the Learning Material covers the syllabus and is compatible with the general goals and principles of the National Curriculum and the National Education Policy.

(ii) *Objectivity of the presentation*

Approval shows that the Learning Material is not biased in any way.

(iii) *Correctness of facts*

Approval signifies that the facts have been checked and are correct.

### 5.1 General criteria

In order to ascertain whether or not the title complies with the above demands, we must ask specific questions related to the following:

1. Is the presentation compatible with the general goals and principles of the curriculum and the National Education Policy?
2. Are the facts correct?
3. Is the syllabus, to a reasonable extent, covered by the content of the Learning Material (textbook, work book and teacher's guide)?
4. Is the textbook in question misleading or biased in any way?

Certain subjects may require additional specific questions (e.g. history and other social sciences):

- Is the relative space given to the different events, conditions and standpoints fair and reasonable?
- Has the author accounted fully and objectively for any controversial issues treated in the presentation?
- Is the presentation such that it favours a particular standpoint, party, and set of values before another, either in the text or through the choice of illustrations?

The approval process for textbooks must be more rigorous than for other materials, and so the system will be used to build a positive list of textbook series deemed to be of sufficiently high quality for use in schools. (The converse of this process would be a negative list, e.g. for supplementary and reading materials, in which a negative list would comprise books deemed unsuitable for use in schools by virtue of containing unsuitable or unacceptable material.)

The process of designing the evaluation instruments involves four stages:

- a) define the criteria to be evaluated;
- b) define the parameters to apply to these criteria (i.e. what are the 'ideal' requirements);
- c) decide on the relative weighting of each criterion;
- d) and design evaluation instruments to ensure that all criteria and parameters are applied equally by each evaluator.

The approval system for general acceptability must be based on a negative list of criteria, which would identify materials as unsuitable or unacceptable for use in schools. In principle, any book, which is deemed by the EMAC to be free of morally, racially or religiously offensive material, has passed the first test of eligibility for use in schools. Thus a book cannot have a 'degree of acceptability': it is either acceptable or not.

This should therefore be the first phase of evaluation. If a title is deemed unsuitable for moral, racial or religious reasons, it should be returned to the publisher with a report of the Committee's objections.

The textbook must assist the pupil and teacher to fulfil the requirements of the curriculum. Essentially, the author's task is to interpret and present the contents of the curriculum in a form which is easy to understand and learn. A pedagogically sound textbook series must therefore fulfil the following:

- ⇒ **concordance with the curriculum** - does the series cover all the requirements of the curriculum?
- ⇒ **content coverage** - does it contain material extending beyond the curriculum? (this could have either a positive or negative influence)

⇒ **sequencing** - is the material sequenced and planned in an appropriate manner?

The pedagogical aspects are divided into two areas, those connected with the content (i.e., factual and methodological), and those connected with the presentation of the materials.

#### a) Content

- ⇒ instructional efficiency
- ⇒ suitability of concept level to age of reader
- ⇒ appropriateness of language level to age of reader
- ⇒ use of feedback, diagnostics, practice, review
- ⇒ accuracy and completeness of information
- ⇒ quality and cogency of concepts
- ⇒ motivational quality
- ⇒ use of techniques to stimulate interest
- ⇒ variety of presentation

#### b) Presentation

This is very much the result of the editorial/design function and should be evaluated to take account of the readability of the book. It is important to remember that the criteria for judging a students' book will be different from those used to evaluate a teachers' guide. In other words, bearing in mind the age and development of the reader, does the presentation actually teach or assist the reader to pick out and prioritise the important information? Does the design motivate the reader to continue reading or does it confuse?

- ⇒ readability
- ⇒ hierarchy of headings (per whole book and by chapter)
- ⇒ font(s?) used
- ⇒ appropriateness of typeface
- ⇒ suitability of type sizes in relation to line length
- ⇒ organisation of illustrations
- ⇒ relevance of illustration to text
- ⇒ relation between picture caption and text
- ⇒ relation between text and 'white space'
- ⇒ type of illustration (photograph, line drawing, shading etc.)
- ⇒ balance between types of illustration (tables, drawings, photos etc.)
- ⇒ use of colour (monochrome, 2-, 4-colour)

#### 5.2 Technical Criteria

Whereas the design of a book affects the readability, the technical aspects will affect its legibility and life. A textbook is almost always a compromise between the pedagogical desires of the authors and the technical (and financial) imperatives of the editor/designer/printer team. The greater the financial and technical constraints, the greater the compromise required from

the pedagogical side. The present process does not intend to evaluate the material specifications, which can be defined even by the buyer.

Under existing procedures, minimum specifications have been established requiring a book to last an average of three years in school. If a publisher wishes to provide higher quality, that is his or her choice, but buyers should be aware of the price/quality match. The following criteria should be applied by the purchaser. It is, however, essential that the publisher be aware of what will be required by announcing the acceptable parameters for these criteria:

*a) Legibility*

Essentially, the finer the printing work, the higher the quality of paper required (e.g., it would be a waste of time to print 5-colour illustration on uncoated newsprint, and similarly art paper would usually be wasted on monochrome letter-press printing).

- ⇒ paper quality in relation to text/illustration
- ⇒ reflectance
- ⇒ opacity
- ⇒ relation of paper to colour/printing technique
- ⇒ paper acidity (reaction with inks and light)
- ⇒ quality, gram mage, coating etc.

*b) Life*

Basically, the longer the life required, the better quality the materials and binding method must be. The evaluation must be carried out against definite book life requirements and a knowledge of the environment it will be used in.

- ⇒ binding
- ⇒ strength
- ⇒ ease of use (e.g., does the book stay open on the desk?)
- ⇒ text paper quality
- ⇒ tear strength
- ⇒ burst strength
- ⇒ cover paper quality
- ⇒ cover finish (varnish, laminate etc.)

### 5.3 Course Books

The Evaluation Sheet for titles intended as Course books is presented as Annex 1.

### 5.4 Supplementary Books

The Evaluation Sheet for titles intended as Supplementary Books is presented as Annex 2.

### 5.5 Reference Books

The Evaluation Sheet for titles intended as Reference Books is presented as Annex 3.

### 5.6 Non-textual materials

Approval of non-textual materials must be approached from two sides: pedagogy and safety. Criteria for pedagogical evaluation are being devised and will be published separately (as Volume 3). Safety standards require a totally different approach and testing method, and should be established in conjunction with a recognised standards bureau such as the Tanzania Bureau of Standards.

## 6. The approval process

The actual process of approval must be as rapid as possible to prevent incurring investment costs to the publisher, and as thorough as possible to ensure high quality. It is vital that schedules for the process be established and adhered to, and that EMAC meetings take place regularly to consider new titles. It would be unrealistic to expect that such a high-level group could meet, for example, on a monthly basis, but it should be possible to arrange bimonthly meetings or at least quarterly meetings.

### 6.1 Secretariat

In terms of timing, the process should be as rapid as possible. Long waiting for approval is unacceptable. It puts a heavy strain on the economy of an educational publisher, who has invested a large amount of money in the development of a title. Long approval times also make it difficult for a publisher to plan the production and to bring out book titles in time for the school start.

In order to keep the time for processing of applications short it is necessary to create an efficient structure for handling these matters. The procedure and the time allowed for processing should be strictly regulated.

To this end, the EMAC needs to have a Secretariat which will handle daily operations, registration and coding of titles, contacts with evaluators, minuting of meetings, secretarial services to the EMAC, etc.

This role will be played by the Book Management Unit of the MOEC, with the Project Manager designated the Registrar of the EMAC.

### 6.2 Registration and coding

- a) The publisher should submit a book title to the Secretariat of EMAC in the form of either four copies of the Work (with covers and any material identifying the publisher or author removed) or four photocopies of the

camera ready copy (CRC), as double-page spreads with all illustrations in place. The material should be accompanied by a covering letter.

- b) The Secretariat will calculate the fee payable (see Section 7), and the publisher will immediately pay the fee to the MOEC Accounts Section.
- c) Once payment has been made and the Work accepted for evaluation, the publisher (taken here to include all representatives, lobbyists, and authors) is forbidden to approach any member of EMAC or the Secretariat or Evaluators on any issue regarding the title under review. It is the responsibility of the Secretariat to notify the publisher of the EMAC decisions. If the EMAC decision is not forthcoming within 6 weeks of submission, the Secretariat should write to the publisher informing the status of the Work in the approval process.
- d) Once payment has been received, the Registrar will check that the publisher/author(s) is not identifiable from the CRC, and will then give the title a coded reference number. All internal EMAC references to the title will use only this reference number as identification. The Coding System is detailed in Volume 2 of this manual, and will not be divulged to anyone other than the EMAC Chairman or the Secretariat.
- e) A time limit must be fixed for the review process, from the date of submission of copies to the EMAC Secretariat until the matter is ready to be presented for decision by the EMAC. It is recommended that the entire process should not exceed six weeks.

### 6.3 Evaluation

- a) The Secretariat will identify three evaluators from the list of EMAC authorised evaluators, bearing in mind the subject and grade under review, and contact them to ascertain their availability to do the work in the required time. The readers will receive a fee for their work which is related to the number of pages (see Section 7). A flat fee is recommended for Reference Books such as dictionaries as Evaluators will not be expected to read every entry on every page.
- b) The Secretariat will send each of these evaluators one copy of the CRC and the relevant evaluation forms bearing the coded reference number. Under no circumstances may the evaluator copy the CRC or make marks on the CRC itself.
- c) The CRC must be returned intact to EMAC together with the completed evaluation form. (Evaluators are recommended to retain a photocopy of their evaluation for future reference.)

#### 6.4 Report to EMAC

- a) On receipt of the three evaluations, the Secretariat will notify the Chairman and inform the members of the need to attend the regular meeting of EMAC.
- b) The Secretariat will prepare a summary of the evaluation forms (Annex 4) with a recommendation for the EMAC to consider.

#### 6.5 EMAC meeting

1. Tentatively, the EMAC should meet bimonthly on a set date each time, provided that on that date at least one submitted title has been duly reviewed and the matter has reached the stage where a decision can be taken.
2. The decisions of the meeting should be:
  - 2.1. All Evaluators agree and EMAC accepts the recommendation;
  - 2.2. Split decision by Evaluators, either EMAC makes a final decision for one alternative, or requires a fourth Evaluator to comment;
  - 2.3. EMAC disagrees with the Evaluators' recommendations. In this unlikely event, EMAC should put its objections in writing and notify the Evaluators of their decision (it is unlikely that these Evaluators would be used again).

#### 6.6 Types of approval

If a book title is approved it should be granted permission to carry the following statement (e.g. for a Kiswahili grade5 book):

*"Approved by the Educational Materials Approval Committee for use in schools under the Kiswahili syllabus of 19... (Grade 5) as a Kiswahili Course book for a period of six (6) years from (date of decision)".*

Reprints do not need further approval, but new editions should be submitted for approval.

There are three types of decisions:

##### *1. Approved*

When a title is approved by EMAC, the publisher should be informed by letter and the title should be included in the list of approved titles at EMAC. This list should be printed and distributed by the Executive Secretariat to all District Education Officers and schools twice a year.

##### *2. Approved subject to modifications*

If a title is found to contain only minor faults, it may be approved subject to certain conditions, e.g. that certain illustrations are removed or changed or that certain textual corrections are made. In this case a copy of the finished

book should be submitted to EMAC as proof that the changes have been made. If the changes have been made satisfactorily, the publisher will be notified of approval.

### 3. *Not approved*

If the decision of the EMAC is "not approved", the publisher must be given the opportunity to appeal against the decision within two weeks, presenting their views on the controversial issues. If the Committee still does not change its decision, the publisher should be able to submit the title for a new evaluation by the EMAC after revision.

The reports of the reviewers should be presented to the publisher by the Secretariat (with the reference codes removed) so that the publisher is able either to comment (in writing) on any negative statements in the reports or to withdraw his title for revision. Material re-presented for renewed evaluation should be sent to one reviewer only in order to ensure that the required revisions have been made.

## 6.7 Appeal

The publisher should be given access to the reports from the reviewers and if approval is denied the publisher must be able to appeal as stated in 6.6. However, if the EMAC decision is still to reject the Work, the publisher must abide by this decision.

## 7. Fees

The direct cost of the operations of EMAC (sitting allowances for members, cost of distribution of lists of approved books) should be fully financed by the Government. The readers' fees payable to the evaluators (and costs of mailing/couriering the CRC) will be paid from the application fees paid by publishers.

The application fee will be payable as follows:

1. For a Work intended as a Course book, Supplementary book or Supplementary reader.

TShs 180,000/- for a Work up to 64 pp. in extent, plus

TShs 60,000/- for an accompanying teachers' guide (flat rate), plus

TShs 600/- per page of pupil's book above 64 pp.

Non-Tanzanian publishers will be required to pay in US Dollars:

USD 250.00 for a Work up to 64 pp. in extent, plus

USD 75.00 for an accompanying teachers' guide (flat rate), plus

USD 1.00 per page of pupil's book above 64 pp.

2. For material, which is being re-presented for evaluation after a requested revision has been carried out, there should be a reduced fee.

**Evaluator's fees**

Each evaluator will be paid according to the following rate:

TShs 50,000/- for a Work up to 64 pp. in extent, plus

TShs 20,000/- for an accompanying teachers' guide (flat rate), plus

TShs 200/- per page of pupil's book above 64 pp.

ANNEX 1 Facsimile questionnaires for information of publishers/authors  
EMAC Evaluation Form EFC4, for a Work intended as a Course  
Book

<i>To be completed by EMAC</i> Work Code No.: _____ Evaluator Code No.: _____	
Date sent to evaluator _____, by _____ (name & designation)	
Date expected from evaluator _____	
Date received from evaluator _____, by _____ (name & designation)	
The Work is intended for use in Grade __, _____ (subject).	
The work is part of a series intended for use in _____.	
Series titles already published _____; planned _____.	
ENCLOSED: Teachers' guide? YES/NO	Copy of syllabus? YES/NO

*To be completed by Evaluator - give page references where appropriate, and use additional sheets if necessary*

**1. General acceptability**

- 1.1. Does the Work contain any material, which may be construed as morally, socially or religiously unacceptable? YES/NO  
If YES, state where the offensive material is to be found (page numbers), and the nature of your objection. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**2. Conformity with the Syllabus, Scope and Sequencing**

- 2.1. Does the Work cover all areas defined in the syllabus for this subject and grade? YES/NO  
If NO, which areas are missing or 'extra'? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 2.2. Does the depth of coverage of each area conform to the minimum syllabus requirements? YES/NO  
If NO, which areas are deficient? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 2.3. Does the depth of coverage of each area exceed the syll. requirements? YES/NO  
If YES, give your opinion on whether this extra material is useful or detrimental to the reader. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 2.4. Is the material sequenced adequately? YES/NO  
If NO, state the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 2.5. Does the planning of the material in terms of scope and sequencing reflect a sound approach to the pedagogical needs of the reader (instructional efficiency)? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Overall Assessment of Item 2:

I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE/CONDITIONAL APPROVAL/REJECT

### 3. Content, Methodology and Language

- 3.1. Does the concept level conform to the age of the reader? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.2. Is the conceptual quality and cogency understandable to the reader? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.3. Is the language appropriate to the level of the reader? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.4. Does the Work give sufficient scope for diagnostic testing? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.5. Does the Work give sufficient scope for feedback to the teacher? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.6. Does the Work give sufficient scope for review by the reader? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.7. Is the information given accurate and complete? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.8. Does the work contain a variety of ways of presenting the subject? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.9. Does the Work use a variety of exercise types? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.10. Is the material likely to motivate and stimulate the reader to read more? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

#### Overall Assessment of Item 3:

I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE/CONDITIONAL APPROVAL/REJECT

### 4. General Presentation

- 4.1. Does the presentation teach or assist the reader to pick out and prioritise important information? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 4.2. Does the design (layout) motivate the reader to continue reading? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 4.3. Is the design likely to confuse the reader (is it readable)? YES/NO  
If YES, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 4.4. Is the hierarchy of headings clear and suited to the subject matter? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 4.5. Is the font used suitable for the age level of the reader? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 4.6. Are the type sizes and line lengths suitable for the age level of the reader?  
YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 4.7. Are the illustrations clear and well organised? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 4.8. Is there a balance between the types of illustration (photos, line drawings, shading etc.)? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 4.9. Are the illustrations relevant to the text? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 4.10. Is there a clear relation between the illustrations and the captions? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 4.11. Is there a clear relation between the text and "white space" (e.g. is space wasted)? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 4.12. Is colour used effectively? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 

Overall Assessment of Item 4:

I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE/CONDITIONAL APPROVAL/REJECT

**5. Other comments** *(Please use extra sheets(s) where necessary)*

---



---



---

**1. Teachers' Guide** *(evaluation of the TG should not affect approval of the pupils' book: comments are intended to guide the publisher and authors, but Evaluator may recommend rejection of the Teachers' Guide, upon which Approval of Pupils' Book should be made conditional to the approval of the Teachers' Guide)*

- 1.1. Is the book congruent with the Pupils' Book? YES/NO
- 1.2. Are teachers likely to refer to the book in the classroom? YES/NO
- 1.3. Does the book help to clarify points of methodology? YES/NO

- 1.4. Does the book give teaching ideas for the classroom? YES/NO
- 1.5. Does the book give extra information? YES/NO
- 1.6. Does the book provide answers to problems in the Pupils' book? YES/NO
- 1.7. Does the book provide extra questions and answers? YES/NO
- 1.8. Comments on the TG \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---

Overall Assessment of Teachers' Guide: I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE/REJECT

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT:**

Having carefully examined this Work according to the criteria mentioned above, I hereby recommend to EMAC the following (*delete whichever is not applicable*):

- a) This Work should be APPROVED for use in Grade \_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ (*subject*) as a Course book conforming to the \_\_\_\_\_ (*subject syllabus*) of 19\_\_.
- b) This Work should be APPROVED for use in Grade \_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ (*subject*) as a Course book conforming to the \_\_\_\_\_ (*subject syllabus*) of 19\_\_, subject to the following minor changes: \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---

- c) This Work should be REJECTED as a Course book for Grade \_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ (*subject*) due to the following reasons: \_\_\_\_\_

---



---

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Name in Full) \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX 2

## EMAC Evaluation Form EFS5, for a Work intended as a Supplementary Book

<i>To be completed by EMAC</i> Work Code No.: _____ Evaluator Code No.: _____	
Date sent to evaluator _____, by _____ (name & designation)	
Date received from evaluator _____, by _____ (name & designation)	
The Work is intended for use in Grade __, _____ (subject).	
The work is part of a series intended for use in _____.	
Series titles already published _____; planned _____.	
ENCLOSED: Teachers' guide? YES/NO	Copy of syllabus? YES/NO

*To be completed by Evaluator - give page references where appropriate, and use additional sheets if necessary.*

### 1. General acceptability

- 1.1. Does the Work contain any material, which may be construed as morally, socially or religiously unacceptable? YES/NO  
If YES, state where the offensive material is to be found (page numbers), and the nature of your objection. \_\_\_\_\_

### 2. Conformity with the Syllabus, Scope and Sequencing

- 2.1. Does the Work generally cover areas as defined in the syllabus for this subject and grade? YES/NO  
If NO, which areas are missing? \_\_\_\_\_
- 2.2. Does the depth of coverage of each area generally conform to the syllabus requirements? YES/NO  
If NO, which areas are deficient? \_\_\_\_\_
- 2.3. Is the material sequenced adequately? YES/NO  
If NO, state the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 2.4. Does the planning of the material in terms of scope and sequencing reflect a sound approach to the pedagogical needs of the reader (instructional efficiency)? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_

#### Overall Assessment of Item 2:

I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE/CONDITIONAL APPROVAL/REJECT

### 3. Content, Methodology and Language

- 3.1. Does the concept level conform to the age of the reader? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_

- 3.2. Is the conceptual quality and cogency understandable to the reader? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.3. Is the language appropriate to the level of the reader? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.4. Does the Work give scope for diagnostic testing, feedback and review? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.5. Is the information given accurate and complete? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 3.6. Is the material likely to motivate and stimulate the reader to read more? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Overall Assessment of Item 3:

I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE/CONDITIONAL APPROVAL/REJECT

**4. General Presentation**

- 4.1. Does the presentation teach or assist the reader to pick out and prioritise important information? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 4.2. Does the design (layout) motivate the reader to continue reading? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 4.3. Is the design likely to confuse the reader (is it readable)? YES/NO  
If YES, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 4.4. Is the hierarchy of headings clear and suited to the subject matter? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 4.5. Is the type size and line length suitable for the age level of the reader? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 4.6. Are the illustrations clear and well organised? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 4.7. Are the illustrations relevant to the text? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 4.8. Is there a clear relation between the illustrations and the captions? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Overall Assessment of Item 4:

I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE/CONDITIONAL APPROVAL/REJECT

5. **Other comments** *(Please use extra sheets(s) where necessary)*

---



---



---

**Teachers' Guide** *(a TG is not essential for a Supplementary book, so evaluation of the TG will not affect approval of the pupils' book: comments are intended to guide the publisher and authors)*

- 1.1. Is the book congruent with the Pupils' Book? YES/NO
- 1.2. Are teachers likely to refer to the book in the classroom? YES/NO
- 1.3. Does the book help to clarify points of methodology? YES/NO
- 1.4. Does the book give teaching ideas for the classroom? YES/NO
- 1.5. Does the book give extra information? YES/NO
- 1.6. Does the book provide answers to problems in the Pupils' book?  
YES/NO
- 1.7. Does the book provide extra questions and answers? YES/NO
- 1.8. Comments on the TG \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT:**

Having carefully examined this Work according to the criteria mentioned above, I hereby recommend to EMAC the following *(delete whichever is not applicable)*:

- a) This Work should be APPROVED for use in Grade \_\_ , \_\_\_\_\_ *(subject)* as a Supplementary book.
- b) This Work should be APPROVED for use in Grade \_\_ , \_\_\_\_\_ *(subject)* as a Supplementary book, subject to the following minor changes: \_\_\_\_\_

---



---

- c) This Work should be REJECTED as a Supplementary book for Grade \_\_ , \_\_\_\_\_ *(subject)* due to the following reasons: \_\_\_\_\_

---



---

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Name in Full) \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX 3

## EMAC Evaluation Form EFR6, for a Work intended as a Reference Book

*To be completed by EMAC* Work Code No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator Code No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Date sent to evaluator \_\_\_\_\_, by \_\_\_\_\_ (name & designation)

Date received from evaluator \_\_\_\_\_, by \_\_\_\_\_ (name & designation)

The Work is intended for use in Grade \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ (subject(s)).

*To be completed by Evaluator - give page references where appropriate, and use additional sheets if necessary.*

### 1. General acceptability

- 1.1. Does the Work contain any material which may be construed as morally, socially or religiously unacceptable? YES/NO  
 If YES, state where the offensive material is to be found (page numbers), and the nature of your objection. \_\_\_\_\_

### 2. Conformity with the Curriculum

- 2.1. If the Work intended for use in a particular grade or grades, is the level of knowledge appropriate for those grades? YES/NO  
 If NO, which grade would this be appropriate for? \_\_\_\_\_
- 2.2. Is the Work likely to provide useful additional knowledge to the reader (in addition to what may be found in Course and Supplementary books)? YES/NO  
 If NO, state the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_

#### Overall Assessment of Item 2:

I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE/CONDITIONAL APPROVAL/REJECT

### 3. Content and Language

- 3.1. Does the concept level conform to the age of the reader? YES/NO  
 If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.2. Is the language appropriate to the level of the reader? YES/NO  
 If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.3. Is the information given accurate and complete? YES/NO  
 If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_

#### Overall Assessment of Item 3:

I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE/CONDITIONAL APPROVAL/REJECT

### 4. General Presentation

- 4.1. Does the presentation teach or assist the reader to pick out and prioritise important information? YES/NO

If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_

4.2. Is the hierarchy of headings clear and suited to the subject matter? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_

4.3. Is the type size and line length suitable for the age level of the reader? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_

4.4. Are the illustrations clear and well organised? YES/NO  
If NO, what are the deficiencies? \_\_\_\_\_

Overall Assessment of Item 4:

I recommend \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVE/CONDITIONAL APPROVAL/REJECT

**5. Other comments** *(Please use extra sheets(s) where necessary)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT:**

Having carefully examined this Work according to the criteria mentioned above, I hereby recommend to EMAC the following *(delete whichever is not applicable)*:

a) This Work should be APPROVED for use in Grade(s) \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ *(subject(s))* as a Reference book.

b) This Work should be APPROVED for use in Grade(s) \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ *(subject(s))* as a Reference book, subject to the following minor changes: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

c) This Work should be REJECTED as a Reference book for Grade \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ *(subject)* due to the following reasons: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Name in Full) \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX 4

EMAC Summary Evaluation Form ESC7 for a Work intended as a  
Course Book

Work Code No.: _____ Evaluator Code Nos.: 1) ____ 2) ____ 3) ____
Date sent to evaluators _____ Date received from evaluators _____
The Work is intended for use in Grade __ , _____ ( <i>subject</i> ).
The work is part of a series intended for use in _____ .
Series titles already published _____ ; planned _____ .
Teachers' guide? YES/NO

CRITERIA	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3
1. General acceptability	A C R	A C R	A C R
2. Conformity with syllabus	A C R	A C R	A C R
3. Content, Methodology,	A C R	A C R	A C R
4. General presentation	A C R	A C R	A C R
5. Other comments			
Teachers' Guide	A C R	A C R	A C R
<b>OVERALL ASSESSMENT</b>	A C R	A C R	A C R

A = Approve C = Approve subject to minor changes R = Reject

Evaluation summarised by: \_\_\_\_\_

(signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(name in full)