

2015-16 Mathematics Interim Review Recommendation & Summary

Publisher Name:	McGraw Hill School Education LLC
Title:	Everyday Math
ISBN #	978-0-02-141001-9
Grade Level(s) or Course:	4
Reviewer ID:	MH & DB

RECOMMENDED AS:

Core Mathematics Program- a complete stand-alone program which meets the focus, coherence and rigor of the Idaho Core Mathematics Standards, with minimal or no need for supplemental materials. Substantial evidence clearly supports the designation of this program as Core.

Other Mathematics Program- a program that substantially, but partially, meets the focus, coherence and rigor of the Idaho Core Mathematics Standards, with some need for supplemental materials. Substantial evidence clearly supports the designation of this program as Other.

Component Mathematics Program- a program designed and intended to be used with another program. This program supports and/or enhances the focus, coherence and rigor of Core and Other Programs. Substantial evidence clearly supports the designation of this program as Component.

Intervention Program- a program designed and intended to target and support students' specific needs. Substantial evidence clearly supports the designation of this program as Intervention.

Does not meet criteria for recommendation as a Curricular Material or Online Resource for Mathematics.

EVIDENCE SUMMARY:

FOCUS- Although supporting standards sometimes use a larger portion of time than necessary, generally materials focus on major work of the grade.

COHERENCE-

Domains and clusters are clearly stated at the beginning of each unit and lesson. They address more than one standard and SMP in the lesson.

RIGOR-

Students continually work on fluency, applying that to real problems found embedded in multi-step word problems & open responses.

CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING-

Students engage in content (standards) by solving contextual problems and apply concepts learned in earlier lessons/grades.

MATHEMATICAL PRACTICES-

SMP are integrated and explicitly tied to all activities in all lessons.

ACCESSIBILITY OF STANDARDS TO ALL STUDENTS-

Every lesson contains multiple differentiation options to address the needs of a broad range of learners with additional activities assigned in the lesson opener.

OTHER:

2015-16 Interim Mathematics Review
Mathematics Evaluation Tool Grades K-8

Publisher: McGraw-Hill School Education, LLC

Title of Material: Everyday Math Grade 4

Author: Bell et al

ISBN #: 978-0-02141-001-1 Copyright 2016

Reviewer ID: DB, MH

Core Mathematics Program- a complete stand-alone program which meets the focus, coherence and rigor of the Idaho Core Mathematics Standards, with minimal or no need for supplemental materials.
Substantial evidence clearly supports the designation of this program as Core.

Other Mathematics Program- a program that substantially, but partially, meets the focus, coherence and rigor of the Idaho Core Mathematics Standards, with some need for supplemental materials.
Substantial evidence clearly supports the designation of this program as Other.

Component Mathematics Program- a program designed and intended to be used with another program. This program supports and/or enhances the focus, coherence and rigor of Core and Other Programs.
Substantial evidence clearly supports the designation of this program as Component.

Intervention Program- a program designed and intended to target and support students' specific needs.
Substantial evidence clearly supports the designation of this program as Intervention.

- Evaluation Form adapted from Instructional Materials Evaluation Toolkit (IMET).

2016
Mathematics
Grades K-8

literacy

collaboration

numbers

communication

problem solving

thinking

intellectual

creativity

critical

information

formulation

systems identification

problem

MATH

21st Century students

solutions

curiosity

solution

formulation

systems identification

problem

Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool

Mathematics, Grades K-8

What Are the Purposes of the IMET?

This Math IMET is designed to help educators determine whether instructional materials are aligned to the Shifts and major features of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The substantial instructional Shifts (<http://www.corestandards.org/other-resources/key-shifts-in-mathematics/>) at the heart of the Common Core State Standards are:

- **Focus** strongly where the Standards focus
- **Coherence:** Think across grades and link to major topics within the grade
- **Rigor:** In major topics, pursue conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, and application with equal intensity.

The IMET draws directly from the following documents:

- Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (www.corestandards.org/Math)
- Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics grade K-8 (http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf)

When to use the IMET

1. Purchasing materials: Many factors go into local purchasing decisions. Alignment to the Standards is a critical factor to consider. This tool is designed to evaluate alignment of instructional materials to the Shifts and the major features of the CCSS. It also provides suggestions of additional indicators to consider in the materials evaluation and purchasing process.
2. Evaluating materials currently in use: The IMET can be used to analyze the degree of alignment of existing materials and help to highlight specific, concrete flaws in alignment. Even where materials and tools currently in use fail to meet one or more of these criteria, the pattern of failure is likely to be informative. States and districts can use the evaluation to create a thoughtful plan to modify or combine existing resources in such a way that students' actual learning experiences approach the focus, coherence, and rigor of the Standards.
3. Developing programs: Those developing new programs can use this tool as guidance for creating aligned curricula. Please note this tool was designed for evaluating comprehensive curricula (including any supplemental or ancillary materials), but it was not designed for the evaluation of standalone supplemental materials.

Who Uses the IMET?

Evaluating instructional materials requires both subject-matter and pedagogical expertise. Evaluators should be well versed in the Standards (www.corestandards.org/Math) for all grades in which materials are being evaluated. This includes understanding the Major Work of the grade (www.achievethecore.org/focus), the Supporting and Additional work, how the content fits into the progressions in the Standards (www.achievethecore.org/progressions), and the expectations of the Standards with respect to conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, and application. Evaluators also should be familiar with the substantial instructional Shifts (<http://www.corestandards.org/other-resources/key-shifts-in-mathematics/>) of Focus, Coherence and Rigor that are listed above.

Getting Started Prior to Evaluation

Assemble all of the materials necessary for the evaluation. It is essential for evaluators to have materials for all grades covered by the program, as some criteria cannot be rated without having access to each grade. In addition, each evaluator should have a reference copy of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM) and the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).

reference copy of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM) and the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).

Before conducting the evaluation itself, it is important to develop a protocol for the evaluation process. The protocol should include having evaluators study the Publishers' Criteria and the IMET. It will also be helpful for evaluators to get a sense of each program overall before beginning the process. At a minimum, this would include reading the front matter of the text, looking at the table of contents and paging through multiple chapters.

Sections 1-3 below should be completed to produce a comprehensive picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the materials under evaluation. Information about areas in need of improvement or supplementation should be shared with internal and external stakeholders.

Navigating the Tool

Begin with Section 1: Non-Negotiable Alignment Criteria

- The Non-Negotiable Alignment Criteria must each be met in full for materials to be considered aligned to the Shifts and the major features of the Common Core State Standards. Each Non-Negotiable Alignment Criterion has one or more metrics associated with it; every one of these metrics must be met in order for the criterion as a whole to be met.
- Examine the relevant materials and use evidence to rate the materials against each criterion and its associated metric(s).
- Record and explain the evidence upon which the rating is based.

Continue to Section 2: Alignment Criteria

- The Alignment Criteria must each be met for materials to be considered aligned to the Shifts and the major features of the Common Core State Standards. Each Alignment Criterion has one or more metric associated with it; a specific number of these metrics must be met or partially met in order for the criterion as a whole to be met.
- Examine the materials in relation to these criteria, assigning each metric a point value. Rate the criterion as "Meets" or "Does Not Meet" based on the number of points assigned. The more points the materials receive on the alignment Criteria, the better they are aligned.

- Record and explain the evidence upon which the rating is based.

Proceed to Section 4: Indicators of Quality

- Indicators of Quality are important considerations that will help evaluators better understand the overall quality of instructional materials. These considerations are not criteria for alignment to the CCSS, but they provide valuable information about additional program characteristics. Evaluators may want to add their own indicators to the examples provided.

Directions for Non-Negotiable 1

Freedom from Obstacles to Focus Criterion	Evidence- Give specific examples.	Rating: (Reviewer only.)
<p>Non-Negotiable 1: Freedom from Obstacles to Focus Materials must reflect the content architecture of the Standards by not assessing the topics named before the grade level where they first appear in the Standards.</p> <p>The Standards foster students' progress to algebra by focusing strongly on arithmetic. Consistent with this focus, certain topics from outside of arithmetic appear only in later grades. Thus, to be aligned, materials must reflect the content architecture of the Standards by not assessing the topics named before the grade level where they first appear in the Standards.</p> <p>In this criterion, "topics named" means the topics that are explicitly named in Metric 1A. No other topics should be added to the list in Metric 1A. (Note that other topics in the standards are addressed in criterion NN2.)</p>	<p>Required Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards.pdf) • Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013) (http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL.1.pdf) • From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides and all assessment components 	<p>Rating this Criterion: Non-Negotiable 1 is rated as Meets or Does Not Meet.</p> <p>To rate Non-Negotiable 1, begin by rating Metric 1A. Since Metric 1A is the only metric for Non-Negotiable 1, the rating for Non-Negotiable 1 is the same as the rating for Metric 1A.</p> <p>If Metric 1A is rated as Does Not Meet, include evidence of when the named topic(s) is/are assessed. If the metric is rated as Meets, list the grade(s) examined in the evaluation.</p>

Metric NN1A:

Materials related to the basic architecture of the Standards by not assessing the listed topics before the grade level indicated.

- Probability, including chance, likely outcomes, probability models. (Introduced in the CCSSM in grade 7)
- Statistical distributions, including center, variation, clumping, outliers, mean, median, mode, range, quartiles; and statistical association or trends, including two-way tables, bivariate measurement data, scatter plots, trend line, line of best fit, correlation. (Introduced in the CCSSM in grade 6)
- Similarity, congruence, or geometric transformations. (Introduced in the CCSSM in grade 8)
- Symmetry of shapes, including line/ reflection symmetry, rotational symmetry. (Introduced in the CCSSM in grade 4)

How to Find the Evidence:

Evaluate the table of contents, all chapter tests, all unit tests, and other such assessment components (including rubrics).

For context, read Criterion #2 from the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013). NOTE: Grade alignments of other topics are addressed in Non-Negotiable 2, Focus and Coherence.)

In this criterion, "topics named" means the topics that are explicitly named in Metric 1A. No other topics should be added to the list in Metric 1A. (Note that other topics in the standards are addressed in criterion NN2.)

Evidence-

Teachers guide: p 6-147

- Lesson 2-5 contains standards addressed, includes assessment check-in, extra practice, enrichment (differentiate)
- Unit assessment includes all standards assessed pg 202 (unit 2)

Teachers Guide: pg 312-313 Unit 4

- Includes standards, differentiation and assessments
- Pg 336-spiral snapshot and spiral trace- showing where standards addressed (318-319)

Includes beginning of year, mid-year, and end of year Assessment guide matches

***Note: lattice method assessed on page 28 of assessment guide-shows no place value understanding!**

(Reviewer only.)

Non-Negotiable 1: Materials must reflect the content architecture of the Standards by not assessing the topics named* before the grade level where they first appear in the Standards.

NN 1 If Metric 1A was rated as Meets, then rate Non-Negotiable 1 as Meets. If Metric 1A was rated as Does Not Meet, then rate Non-Negotiable 1 as Does Not Meet. Check the final rating.

Then, briefly describe the strengths and weaknesses of these materials in light of the above Criterion. (Reviewer only.)

Before moving to Non-Negotiable 2, record the final Meets or Does Not Meet rating in the Evaluation Summary.

Meets

Does Not Meet

Strengths/Weaknesses:
Includes progression of standards, with a variety of activities for students, workbook/journal allows students to "write" answers

Weakness: seems to jump around and go back and forth)

Directions for Non-Negotiable 2

Focus and Coherence

Non-Negotiable 2:

Focus and Coherence

Materials must focus coherently on the Major Work of the grade in a way that is consistent with the progressions in the Standards.

Focus and coherence are the two major evidence-based design principles of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM, p. 3). Focus is necessary in order to fulfill the ambitious promise the states have made to their students by adopting the Standards: greater achievement at the college and career ready level; greater depth of understanding of mathematics; and a rich classroom environment in which reasoning, sense-making, applications, and a range of mathematical practices flourish. In simpler terms, a mile-wide, inch-deep curriculum translates to less time per topic. Less time means less depth and moving on without many students. Thus, materials must focus coherently on the Major Work of the grade in a way that is consistent with the progressions in the Standards.

Metric NN2A:

In each grade K–8, students and teachers using the materials as designed devote the large majority of time to the Major Work of the grade.

How to Find the Evidence:

Familiarize yourself with the Major Work of the grade being evaluated (see the Focus by Grade Level documents.)
Evaluate the table of contents and any pacing guides. Do not stop there; also evaluate units, chapters, lessons, homework assignments, and assessments. (Evaluate both student and teacher materials.)
Consider time spent on the Major Work of the grade and judge qualitatively whether students and teachers using the materials as designed will devote the large majority of time to the Major Work of the grade.

For context, read Criterion #1 in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013)

Required Materials

- Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (http://corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards.pdf)
- Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013) (http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL.1.pdf)
- Focus by Grade Level for the grade being evaluated (www.achievethecore.org/focus)
- From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides, student texts and workbooks

Rating this Criterion:

Non-Negotiable 2 is rated as Meets or Does Not Meet

To rate Non-Negotiable 2, first rate metrics 2A–2H. Each of these eight metrics must be rated as Meets in order for Non-Negotiable 2 to be rated as Meets. Rate each metric 2A–2H as Meets or Does Not Meet/Insufficient Evidence. If the evidence examined shows that the Criterion is met, then mark the Criterion Meets. If the evidence examined shows that the Criterion is not met—or if there is insufficient evidence to make a determination—then mark the Criterion as Does Not Meet/Insufficient Evidence. Support all ratings with evidence.

(Reviewer only.)

___x___ Meets

___ Does Not Meet/

Insufficient Evidence

<p>Metric NN2B: Supporting Work, where present, enhances focus and coherence simultaneously by also engaging students in the Major Work of the grade.</p> <p>How to Find the Evidence: Familiarize yourself with the Major Work and Supporting Work of the grade being evaluated (see the Focus by Grade Level documents.) Evaluate chapters and lessons that focus on Supporting Work. NOTE: Example of evaluating this Criterion might include looking at whether materials for K-5 generally treat data displays as an occasion for solving grade-level word problems using the four operations (e.g., see 3.MD.B.3); or whether materials for grade 7 take advantage of opportunities to use probability to support ratios, proportions, and percentages. For context, read Criterion #3 in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Supporting clusters appear only where they support and engage students in the major work of the grade and these clusters only become the focus of lessons in later units: Grade 4: 4MD.1 and 4.MD2 supporting clusters addressed in conjunction with the major work within the NBT and NF domains-Lesson 6-6 students use multi-digit multiplication (4NBT.5) to solve number stories involving conversions between ounces, pounds, and tons Note: lesson 5-10 rotations and angles in the middle of fractions-angles are taught in unit 1-unusual organization</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><u> </u> X _Meets <u> </u> Does Not Meet/ Insufficient Evidence</p>
<p>Metric NN2C: Materials base content progressions on the grade-by-grade progressions in the Standards. Content from previous or future grades does not unduly interfere with or displace on-grade-level content.</p> <p>How to Find the Evidence: Evaluate the table of contents and any pacing guides. Do not stop there; also evaluate units, chapters, and lessons in both student and teacher materials. NOTE: In some cases it may be possible that aligned materials might address some aspects of a topic in a strategic way before or after the grade level in which the topic is central in the Standards' progressions; for example, a curriculum author might purposefully choose to explore adding fractions with unlike denominators in a way appropriate to grade four, recognizing that this work is not really required until the next grade. However, any such purposeful discrepancies in content progressions should enhance the required learning in each grade; not unduly interfere with or displace grade-level content; and be clearly aimed at helping students meet the Standards as written rather than effectively rewriting the progressions in the Standards. And in all cases, note that Non-Negotiable 1 must be met for materials to be aligned. For context, read Criterion #5a in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Teachers guide -contains "unpacking the standards", clearly articulates the progression of each standard in the grade -differentiation support such as Readiness and Enrichment activities that are included in each lesson assists students to reinforce skills Grade 4: content from previous grades revisited to form bridge for 4th grade content. Lesson 3-1 fraction work begins with equivalent fractions (3rd grade standard) Spiral tracker doesn't always connect to previous grades Games pg E12-14 shows correlation to 3rd grade</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><u> </u> X _Meets <u> </u> Does Not Meet/ Insufficient Evidence</p>

<p>Metric NN2D: Materials give all students extensive work with on-grade-level problems. How to Find the Evidence: Evaluate both student and teacher materials. If the materials provide resources for differentiated learning, consider whether lower-performing students have opportunities to engage with grade-level problems. Also consider whether higher-performing students are given opportunities to learn current grade-level content in greater depth. For context, read Criterion #5b in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Readiness activities compare students who need scaffolding for the main tasks. Extra practice provides all students with meaningful practice of grade-level content from the lesson Grade 4- Lesson 7-4 multiplying fractions by a whole number includes readiness activity of rewriting the problem as repeated addition-reinforcing the connection between adding fractions and multiplying a fraction by a whole number using fraction circles, number lines, models. Student friendly activity cards for small group/partner Assessment check-in, recommendations for interventions, open response for enrichment and differentiation</p> <p>No separate ELL component in print, only online</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet/Insufficient Evidence</p>
<p>Metric NN2E: Materials relate on-grade-level concepts explicitly to prior knowledge from earlier grades. How to Find the Evidence: Evaluate both student and teacher materials. NOTE: Examples of evaluating this Criterion might include looking at the way the materials extend basic ideas of place value across the decimal point; or the role that properties of operations play when the materials extend arithmetic beyond whole numbers to fractions, variables, and expressions. More generally, cluster headings in the Standards sometimes signal key moments where reorganizing and extending previous knowledge is important in order to accommodate new knowledge (e.g., see cluster headings that use the phrase "Apply and extend previous understanding"). For context, read Criterion #5c in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Grade 4: Unit 7 organizer states "Building upon informal strategies such as repeated addition...and using a variety of representations allows students to see that multiplying a fraction by a whole number is conceptually the same as multiplying two whole numbers." Language is relevant to Grade 4 by extending and applying previous understanding</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet/Insufficient Evidence</p>
<p>Metric NN2F: Review of material from previous grades is clearly identified as such to the teacher, and teacher and students can see what their specific responsibility is for the current year. How to Find the Evidence: Evaluate the table of contents, but do not stop there; also evaluate units, chapters, lessons, homework assignments and assessments. (Evaluate both student and teacher materials.) Identify any content from previous grades and check whether it is identified as such. For context, read Criterion #5a in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Lessons and activities contain minimal amounts of materials from earlier grades-clearly identified as previous standards Grade 4: lessons 1-7 and 1-9 traditional addition and subtractions algorithms introduced, lesson focus begins with review of addition and subtractions strategies used as bridge for conceptual understanding of algorithm. Beginning of the year assessment-measures student knowledge and skills related to content in the first few units Differentiation support cover topics of the major clusters</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet/Insufficient Evidence</p>

<p>Metric NN2G: Materials include learning objectives that are visibly shaped by CCSSM cluster headings. How to Find the Evidence: Select several clusters from the Major Work in the grade being evaluated. Evaluate teacher and student materials in relation to these clusters. For context, read Criterion #6a in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Lesson begins with a lesson opener which clearly outlines the CCSS cluster headings addressed in the lesson content; includes learning objectives called Goals for Mathematical Content (GMC's) that enable finer-grained tracking of student progress. GMC's are broken down versions of the standards</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) X_ Meets ____ Does Not Meet/ Insufficient Evidence</p>
<p>Metric NN2H: Materials include problems and activities that serve to connect two or more clusters in a domain, or two or more domains in a grade, in cases where these connections are natural and important. How to Find the Evidence: In the grade being evaluated, choose two or more clusters or two or more domains for which connections are natural and important. Evaluate the units, chapters, and lessons that deal with the chosen topics, looking for problems and activities that serve to connect the chosen clusters or domains. NOTE: An example of evaluating this Criterion might include looking at whether problems in grade 4 sometimes or often involve students applying their developing computation skills (detailed in domain NBT) in the context of solving word problems (detailed in domain OA). For context, read Criterion #6b in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- All lessons begin with identifying focus clusters. All activities list standards that are addressed in the activity and many of them connect multiple domains. Grade 4: Lesson 6-8 students interpret remainders for multidigit division problems in the context of number stories, connecting standards from 2 domains: 4.OA.3 and 4.NBT.6</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) X_ Meets ____ Does Not Meet/ Insufficient Evidence</p>

Non-Negotiable 2:

Focus and Coherence

Materials must focus coherently on the Major Work of the grade in a way that is consistent with the progressions in the Standards.

NN 2 If all Metrics 2A – 2H were rated as Meets, then rate Non-Negotiable 2 as Meets. If one or more Metric was rated Does Not Meet/Insufficient Evidence, then rate Non-Negotiable 2 as Does Not Meet. Check the final rating. Then, briefly describe the strengths and weaknesses of these materials in light of the above Criterion. (Reviewer only.)

Before moving to Alignment Criterion 1, record the final Meets or Does Not Meet rating in the Evaluation Summary.

Now continue by evaluating the Alignment Criterion 1 for Rigor and Balance.

Directions for Alignment Criterion 1

Rigor and Balance

Alignment Criterion 1: Rigor and Balance

Materials must reflect the balances in the Standards and help students meet the Standards' rigorous expectations.

The Standards set expectations for attention to all three aspects of rigor: conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, and applications. Thus, materials must reflect the balances in the Standards and help students meet the Standards' rigorous expectations.

Required Materials

- Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (http://corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards.pdf)
- Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013) (http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf)
- Focus by Grade Level for the grade being evaluated (achievethecore.org/focus)
- Situation Types for the Operations in Word Problems (achievethecore.org/situation-types)
- From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides, student texts and workbooks

(Reviewer only.)

 X Meets

 Does Not Meet

Strengths/Weaknesses:

Domains/clusters are clearly stated at the beginning of each unit/lesson
Address more than one standard and SMP for each lesson

Rating this Criterion:

Alignment Criterion 1 is rated as Meets or Does Not Meet.

To rate Alignment Criterion 1, first rate metrics 1A, 1B, and 1C. Rate each metric as Meets (2 points), Partially Meets (1 point), or Does Not Meet (0 points). For each metric, guiding questions are provided to aid in gathering evidence.

Since there are three metrics, and each metric is worth up to 2 points, the maximum possible rating across all three metrics is 6 points. Ideally, aligned materials will earn all 6 points; materials are judged to have met Alignment Criterion 1 if the materials rate 5 or 6 points. This threshold recognizes that evaluators sometimes differ in how they assess features such as rigor and balance, while at the same time ensuring that no single metric can receive a rating of zero and be aligned to the Shifts and major features of the CCSSM.

Use the questions for AC Metric 1A to evaluate Metric 1A. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 1A.

 Meets (2)

 Partially Meets (1)

 Does Not Meet (0)

-Choose a cluster/Standard from the Major Work that is aligned to each aspect of rigor and use it to evaluate these metrics. It is most helpful if the same clusters/Standards are chosen for all of the programs being evaluated. (Guidance in choosing clusters/Standards is included in "How to Find the Evidence".)

Evidence-
Each lesson features high-quality conceptual problems as in the Open Response/Reengagement
Grade 4: Open response lesson 1-8 cracking the Muffin Code in Math masters-looking for structure and patterns

Evidence-
Grade 4: Lesson 3-1 thru 3-3 students extend understanding of fraction equivalence by working with equal-sharing situations, fraction circles, and number lines

Metric AC1A:
The materials support the development of students' conceptual understanding of key mathematical concepts, especially where called for in specific content Standards or cluster headings.

How to Find the Evidence:
Select one or more cluster(s) or Standard(s) from the Major Work for the grade being evaluated that relate specifically conceptual understanding to use throughout the questions associated with this metric. NOTE: Some examples of clusters or Standards that call for conceptual understanding include: K.OA.A.1, (1.NBT.B, 1.NBT.C), (2.NBT.A, 2.NBT.B), (3.OA.A.1, 3.OA.A.2), 4.NF.A, (4.NBT.A, 4.NBT.B), 5.NF.B, (5.NBT.A, 5.NBT.B), 6.RP.A, 6.EE.A.3, 7.NS.A, 7.EE.A, 8.EE.B, 8.F.A, 8.G.A
Clusters or Standards grouped by parentheses are closely connected and could be analyzed together.
For context, read Criterion #4a in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).

Is conceptual understanding attended to thoroughly where the Standards set explicit expectations for understanding or interpreting? Evaluate lessons, chapter/unit assessments and homework assignments, paying attention to work aligned to Standards that explicitly call for understanding or interpreting. NOTE: Examples of evaluating this Criterion might include looking at how well the multi-digit addition and subtraction algorithms are developed and explained on the basis of place value and properties of operations; or how well the multi-digit multiplication and division algorithms are developed and explained on the basis of place value and properties of operations; or how well solving equations is presented and explained as a process of reasoning.

Do the materials feature high-quality conceptual problems and conceptual discussion questions? Evaluate lessons, chapter/unit assessments, and homework assignments.
NOTE: Example of conceptual problems might include such questions as "Find a number greater than 1/5 and less than 1/4," or "if the divisor does not change and the dividend increases, what happens to the quotient?"

<p>Do the materials feature opportunities to identify correspondences across mathem... representations? Evaluate lessons, chapter/unit assessments and homework assignments. NOTE: Examples of evaluating this Criterion might include looking at whether students are supported in identifying correspondences among: the verbal description of a situation, the diagrams that distill its mathematical features, and the equations that model it; or equivalent forms of numbers (e.g., 3 and 6/2) and the number line; or rational number operations and representations of them via models such as the vector model; or the expression that defines a function and the graph that shows the relationship.</p>	<p>Evidence- Grade 4: Lesson 1-3 through 1-8 lessons begin with rounding and move onto estimation and then algorithms moving students through diagrams and dialogue to discover reasons behind the algorithm</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 1B to evaluate Metric 1B. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 1B.</p> <p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><u> </u> X Meets (2)</p> <p><u> </u> Partially Meets (1)</p> <p><u> </u> Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p>Metric AC1B: The materials are designed so that students attain the fluencies and procedural skills required by the Standards.</p> <p>How to Find the Evidence: Select one or more cluster(s) or Standard(s) from the Major Work for the grade being evaluated that relate specifically to fluency and procedural skill to use throughout the questions associated with this metric. NOTE: Some examples of Standards that call for procedural skill and fluency include: K.OA.A.5, 1.OA.C.6, 2.OA.B.2, 2.NBT.B.5, 3.OA.C.7, 3.NBT.A.2, 4.NBT.B.4, 5.NBT.B.5, 6.NS.B.2, and 6.NS.B.3, 6.EE.A.7, 7.NS.A.7, 7.EE.A.1, 7.EE.B.4a, 8.EE.C.7, 8.EE.C.8b For context, read Criterion #4b in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Each lesson in grade 4 begin with a mental math and fluency exercise that develops fluency with basic facts and other skills that require automaticity Homelink 2-2 pg 39 procedural for area of a rectangle, along with fluency; fluency pg 91, procedural pg 93</p>	
<p>Is progress toward fluency and procedural skill interwoven with students' developing conceptual understanding of the operations in question? Evaluate lessons, chapter/unit assessments, daily routines, and homework assignments for evidence that the development of fluency and procedural skill is supported by conceptual understanding.</p> <p>Are purely procedural problems and exercises present that include cases in which opportunistic strategies are valuable and generic cases that require efficient algorithms present? Evaluate lessons, chapter/unit assessments, daily routines, and homework assignments. NOTE: Examples of problems in which opportunistic strategies are valuable might include the sum $698 + 240$ or the system $x + y = 1$, $2x + 2y = 3$. Examples of generic cases that require efficient algorithms might include the sum $8767+2286$ or the system $6y + x = x + 3$, $-x = 1 + 2y$.</p>	<p>Evidence- Lessons in grade 4 give opportunities for students to use algorithms- Grade 4 continues practice using algorithms in addition and subtraction, multiplication and division</p>	

<p>Do the materials in grades K–6 provide repeated practice toward attainment of fluency Standards? Evaluate lessons, daily routines, and homework assignments for evidence of repeated practice toward attainment of the following K–6 Standards that set an explicit expectation of fluent (accurate and reasonably fast) computation: K.OA.A.5, 1.OA.C.6, 2.OA.B.2, 2.NBT.B.5, 3.OA.C.7, 3.NBT.A.2, 4.NBT.B.4, 5.NBT.B.5, 6.NS.B.2, 6.NS.B.3.</p>	<p>Evidence- Students apply their fluency with basic facts to learning algorithms. Using learning from 3rd, students begin using partial product, then move toward the traditional algorithm. Mental math and fluency games continue throughout the year Homelink 2-2 pg 39 procedural for area of a rectangle, along with fluency; fluency pg 91, procedural pg 93</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 1C to evaluate Metric 1C. Metric 1C. (Reviewer only.) X Meets (2) Partially Meets (1) Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p>Metric AC1C: The materials are designed so that teachers and students spend sufficient time working with engaging applications, without losing focus on the Major Work of each grade. How to Find the Evidence: Select one or more cluster(s) or Standard(s) from the Major Work for the grade being evaluated that relate specifically application to use throughout the questions associated with this metric. NOTE: Some examples of clusters or Standards that call for application include: K.OA.A.2, 1.OA.A, 2.OA.A, 3.OA.A.3, 3.OA.D.8, 4.OA.A.3, 4.NF.B.3d, 4.NF.B.4c, 5.NF.B.6, 5.NF.B.7c, 6.RP.A.3, 6.NS.A.1, 6.EE.B.7, 6.EE.C.9, 7.RP.A, 7.NS.A.3, 7.EE.B.3, 8.EE.C.8c, 8.F.F.B For context, read Criterion #4c in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Many opportunities to solve problems contextually-math boxes throughout grades 4 and 5 are contextual word problems. Grade 4: lesson 6-4, contextual problems using partial quotient division Student Journal pg 85, 116</p>	
<p>Are there are single- and multi-step contextual problems, including non-routine problems, that develop the mathematics of the grade, afford opportunities for practice, and engage students in problem solving? Do the problems attend thoroughly to those places in the content Standards where expectations for multi-step and real-world problems are explicit? Evaluate lessons, chapter/unit assessments, and homework assignments. Do application problems particularly stress applying the Major Work of the grade? Evaluate lessons, chapter/unit assessments, and homework assignments. NOTE: Examples of evaluating this Criterion might include looking at: how well, by the end of grade 2, students using the materials as designed can represent and solve a full range of one-step addition and subtraction word problems; or how well, by the end of grade 3, students using the materials as designed can represent and solve a full range of one-step multiplication and division word problems; or how well these basic situation types for each operation are carried coherently across the grades, (e.g., with fractions and algebraic expressions); or, in all grades, whether the problems connect concepts, Standards, and domains in ways that are natural and important. For a list of situation types for one-step addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division problems, see Situation Type _____ the Operations in Word Problems</p>	<p>Evidence- Grade 4: continual practice of solving word problems with multiple steps and all four operations (student journal see above) Lesson 8-12 applying fractions, 4-12 multi step number stories, open response 5-6</p>	

Does modeling **_____** and slowly across K–8, with applications that are relatively simple **_____** earlier grades and when students are encountering new content? In grades 6–8, do the problems begin to provide opportunities for students to make their own assumptions or simplifications in order to model a situation mathematically? Read Standard for Mathematical Practice 4, Model with Mathematics. Evaluate lessons, chapter/unit assessments, and homework assignments.

Evidence-
Grade 4: Units 7 and 8 **_____** multiplying a fraction by a whole number in contextual problems, using measurement and recipes. Students model problems and use non-routine problems

**Alignment Criterion 1:
Rigor and Balance**

Materials must reflect the balances in the Standards and help students meet the Standards' rigorous expectations.

AC1 Materials must earn at least 5 out of 6 points to meet this Alignment Criterion. If materials earn less than 5 out of 6 points, the Criterion has not been met. Check the final rating. Then, briefly describe the strengths and weaknesses of these materials in light of the above Criterion. (Reviewer only.)

Before moving to Alignment Criterion 2, record the final Meets or Does Not Meet rating in the Evaluation Summary.

Directions for Alignment Criterion 2

Standards for Mathematical Practice

**Alignment Criterion 2:
Standards for Mathematical Practice**

Materials must demonstrate authentic connections between content Standards and practice Standards.

The Standards require that designers of instructional materials connect the mathematical practices to mathematical content in instruction. Thus, materials must demonstrate authentic connections between content Standards and practice Standards.

Required Materials:

- Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (http://corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards.pdf)
- Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013) (http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf)
- Focus by Grade Level for the grade being evaluated (www.achievethecore.org/focus)
- From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides, student texts and workbooks

(Reviewer only.)

_____ X Meets

_____ Does Not Meet

Strengths/Weaknesses:
Contextual problems throughout, open response lessons for each unit

Rating this Criterion

Alignment Criterion 2 is rated as Meets or Does Not Meet.

To rate Alignment Criterion 2, first rate metrics 2A, 2B, and 2C. Rate each metric as Meets (2 points), Partially Meets (1 point), or Does Not Meet (0 points). For each metric, guiding questions are provided to aid in gathering evidence.

Since there are three metrics, and each metric is worth up to 2 points, the maximum possible rating across all three metrics is 6 points. Ideally, aligned materials will earn all 6 points; materials are judged to have met Alignment Criterion 2 if the materials earn 5 or 6 points.

This threshold recognizes that evaluators sometimes differ in how they assess features such as mathematical practices, while at the same time ensuring that no single metric can receive a rating of zero and be aligned to the Shifts and major features of the CCSSM.

<p>Metric AC2A: Materials address the practice Standards in such a way as to enrich the Major Work of the grade; practices strengthen the focus on Major Work instead of detracting from it, in both teacher and student materials.</p> <p>How to Find the Evidence: Familiarize yourself with the Major Work of the grade being evaluated (see the Focus by Grade Level documents.) Evaluate teacher and student materials for evidence that the mathematical practices support and connect to the focus of the grade. NOTE: Examples of evaluating this Criterion might include looking at whether, in grades K–5, students using the materials are supported to look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning about the addition table, the multiplication table, the properties of operations, the relationship between addition and subtraction or multiplication and division, and the place value system; or whether, in grades 6–8, students using the materials are supported to look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning about proportional relationships and linear functions.</p> <p>For context, read Criterion #8 in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Grade 4: Lesson 1-3 practice standards 6 and 7, NBT 2, NBT 1-students make generalizations with place value, repeated reasoning and patterns to follow in place value.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Meets (2)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets (1)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p>Metric AC2B: Materials attend to the full meaning of each practice Standard.</p> <p>How to Find the Evidence: For context, read Criterion #7 and Criterion #9 in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Each lesson has integrated practice standards annotated in the teachers manuals. Each unit has a focus standard. At the lesson level, multiple practice standards are clearly addressed in every activity Grade 4: lesson 1-8 students focus on standard 7as they recognize and use the structure of the base-10 place value system to solve a series of non-routine problems</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 2B to evaluate Metric 2B. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 2B.</p> <p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Meets (2)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets (1)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p>Over the course of any given year of instruction, is each mathematical practice Standard meaningfully present in the form of assignments, activities, or problems that stimulate students to develop the habits of mind described in the practice Standard? Evaluate lessons, chapter/unit assessments, and homework assignments for evidence of each mathematical practice being meaningfully present in instruction.</p>		

<p>Do the materials meet the practice Standards as developing across grades or grade levels? Are the practice Standards in early grades appropriately simple? Do they display an arc of growing sophistication across the grades?</p>	<p>Evidence- SMP are integrated and explicitly tied to all activities in every lesson. Expectations for students with regard to the MP increase in sophistication as they age. Grade 4: Lesson 1-3 practice standards 6 and 7, NBT 2, NBT 1-students make generalizations with place value, repeated reasoning and patterns to follow in place value.</p>	
<p>Are there teacher-directed materials that explain the role of the practice Standards in the classroom and in students' mathematical development? Are alignments to practice Standards accurate?</p>	<p>Evidence- Grade 4: lesson 1-8 students focus on standard 7as they recognize and use the structure of the base-10 place value system to solve a series of non-routine problems</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 2C to evaluate Metric 2C. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 2C.</p> <p>(Reviewer only.) _x_ Meets (2)</p>
<p>Metric AC2C: Materials support the Standards' emphasis on mathematical reasoning. How to Find the Evidence: For context, read Criterion #10 in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>Evidence- Students are encouraged to construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others while engaging with grade-level work Grade 4: lesson 1-3 developing academic language to agree or disagree using reasons, sentence frames included Grade 5: lesson 3-7 Students construct viable arguments while sharing how they can estimate the sums of fractions, they support their arguments and explain their reasoning while answering questions, they justify their solutions by explaining them as distances on the number line. Most lessons support academic language through the use of sentence frames embedded in the lesson</p>	<p>Partially Meets (1) Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p>Do the materials support students in constructing viable arguments and critiquing the arguments of others concerning grade-level mathematics that is detailed in the content Standards? Read Standard for Mathematical Practice 3. Evaluate teacher and student materials to ensure that students are given opportunities to reason with grade-level mathematics.</p>	<p>Evidence- Students are encouraged to construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others while engaging with grade-level work Grade 4: lesson 1-3 developing academic language to agree or disagree using reasons, sentence frames included Student journal pg 38 writing and reasoning, pg 85, 132</p>	
<p>Do the materials support students in producing not only answers and solutions, but also, in a grade-appropriate way, arguments, explanations, diagrams, mathematical models, etc., especially in the Major Work of the grade? Familiarize yourself with the Major Work of the grade being evaluated (see the Focus by Grade Level documents.) Evaluate teacher and student materials, to understand the types of work students are expected to produce.</p>	<p>Evidence- Students are encouraged to construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others while engaging with grade-level work Grade 4: lesson 1-3 developing academic language to agree or disagree using reasons, sentence frames included Student journal pg 38 writing and reasoning, pg 85, 132</p>	

<p>Do materials explicitly attend to the specialized language of mathematics? Is the language of argument, problem solving, and mathematical explanations taught rather than assumed? Evaluate teacher and student materials, paying attention to how mathematical language is taught.</p> <p>NOTE: Examples of evaluating this Criterion might include looking at whether students are supported in: basing arguments on definitions; using the method of providing a counterexample; or recognizing that examples alone do not establish a general statement.</p>	<p>Evidence- Students are encouraged to construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others while engaging with grade-level work Grade 4: lesson 1-3 developing academic language to agree or disagree using reasons, sentence frames included Academic language development sidebars TE pg 562, 692</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p>___x___ Meets</p> <p>_____ Does Not Meet</p> <p>Strengths/Weaknesses:</p> <p>TE sidebar include academic language development to guide teachers, many student responses to write and explain</p>
<p>Alignment Criterion 2: Standards for Mathematical Practice</p> <p>Materials must demonstrate authentic connections between content Standards and practice Standards.</p> <p>AC2 Materials must earn at least 5 out of 6 points to meet this Alignment Criterion. If materials earn less than 5 out of 6 points, the Criterion has not been met. Check the final rating. Then, briefly describe the strengths and weaknesses of these materials in light of the above Criterion. (Reviewer only.)</p>	<p>Required Materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (http://corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards.pdf) • Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013) (http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf) • From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides, student texts and workbooks 	<p>Rating this Criterion: Alignment Criterion 3 is rated as Meets or Does Not Meet.</p> <p>To rate Alignment Criterion 3, first rate metrics 3A, 3B, and 3C. Rate each metric as Meets (2 points), Partially Meets (1 point), or Does Not Meet (0 points).</p> <p>Since there are three metrics, and each metric is worth up to 2 points, the maximum possible rating across all three metrics is 6 points. Ideally, aligned materials will earn all 6 points; materials are judged to have met Alignment Criterion 3 if the materials earn 5 or 6 points. This threshold recognizes that evaluators sometimes differ in how they assess features such as support for special population, while at the same time ensuring that no single metric can receive a rating of zero and be aligned to the Shifts and major features of the CCSSM.</p>
<p>Alignment Criterion 3: Access to the Standards for All Students</p> <p>Materials must provide supports for English Language Learners and other special populations.</p> <p>Because Standards are for all students, alignment requires thoughtful support to ensure all students are able to meet the Standards. Thus, aligned materials must provide supports for English Language Learners and other special populations.</p>	<p>Required Materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (http://corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards.pdf) • Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013) (http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf) • From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides, student texts and workbooks 	<p>Rating this Criterion: Alignment Criterion 3 is rated as Meets or Does Not Meet.</p> <p>To rate Alignment Criterion 3, first rate metrics 3A, 3B, and 3C. Rate each metric as Meets (2 points), Partially Meets (1 point), or Does Not Meet (0 points).</p> <p>Since there are three metrics, and each metric is worth up to 2 points, the maximum possible rating across all three metrics is 6 points. Ideally, aligned materials will earn all 6 points; materials are judged to have met Alignment Criterion 3 if the materials earn 5 or 6 points. This threshold recognizes that evaluators sometimes differ in how they assess features such as support for special population, while at the same time ensuring that no single metric can receive a rating of zero and be aligned to the Shifts and major features of the CCSSM.</p>

<p>Metric AC3A: Support for English Language Learners and other special populations is thoughtful and helps those students meet the same Standards as all other students. The language in which problems are posed is carefully considered.</p> <p>How to Find the Evidence: Evaluate teacher and student materials, paying attention to supports offered for special populations.</p>	<p>Evidence- Every lesson contains multiple specific suggestions for work with special populations of students: ELL, students who need scaffolding, extensions, and additional practices. Additional activities for Readiness, Enrichment and Extra Practice address the differentiation needs of every student. Common misconceptions allow teachers to see potential misunderstandings that may occur when learning new concepts. Student reference books for grade 3-6 provide support for students on key concepts. ELL on line and in text- TE pg 697</p>	<p>Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> X Meets (2)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets (1)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p>Metric AC3B: Materials provide appropriate level and type of scaffolding, differentiation, intervention, and support for a broad range of learners with gradual removal of supports, when needed, to allow students to demonstrate their mathematical understanding independently.</p> <p>How to Find the Evidence: Evaluate teacher and student materials, paying attention to whether materials provide differentiation that will lead all learners to engage with on-grade-level content.</p>	<p>Evidence- Every lesson contains multiple differentiation options to address the needs of a broad range of learners with additional activities described in the lesson opener; differentiation options in every regular lesson include Readiness, Enrichment, and extra practice activities. As students develop a better understanding of a particular concept or skill supports are gradually removed. Grade 4: Lesson 1-1 in preparation for work with generalizing place-value understanding for multi-digit whole numbers/(4NBT2) students make and use a Compact Place-Value Flip Book. The support of the flip book is gradually reduced in practice activities and removed by Unit 4. TE pg 697 differentiation, readiness checks, extra practice</p>	<p>Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> X Meets (2)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets (1)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p>Metric AC3C: Design of lessons recommends and facilitates a mix of instructional approaches for a variety of learners such as using multiple representations (e.g., including models, using a range of questions, checking for understanding, flexible grouping, pair-share).</p> <p>How to Find the Evidence: Evaluate teacher materials, noting instructional approaches suggested for whole class and differentiated lessons and activities.</p>	<p>Evidence- Every activity including the differentiation options provide one or more suggestions for possible instructional approaches including grouping suggestions Grade 4: Lessons 6-1, 6-3, 6-7 provide a building sequence of practice with different representations of and approaches to multi-digit division. Sequence develops the partial quotient division algorithm through the use of extended division facts, multiples, division area models, and finally the algorithm (not tested). Students who require more scaffolding through out are encouraged to use concrete representations (**students are not required to know algorithm in 4th grade)</p>	<p>Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> X Meets (2)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets (1)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet (0)</p>

**Alignment Criterion 3:
Access to the Standards for All Students**

Materials must provide supports for English Language Learners and other special populations.

AC3 Materials must earn at least 5 out of 6 points to meet this Alignment Criterion. If materials earn less than 5 points, the Criterion has not been met. Check the final rating. Then, briefly describe the strengths and weaknesses of these materials in light of the above Criterion. (Reviewer only.)

Move to the Evaluation Summary and record the final Meets or Does Not Meet rating.

(Reviewer only.)

Meets

Does Not Meet

Strengths/Weaknesses:

S: Active learning embedded throughout;
practices/assessment checks are embedded
W: odd choice of sequence

Once an evaluation for alignment to the Shifts and major features of the CCSS has been conducted using Sections 1-3, it's important to evaluate for overall quality and best practices. A starting list of Indicators of Quality are suggested below. States, districts and others evaluating instructional materials are encouraged to add to this list to ensure materials reflect local contexts. For background information on some of the Indicators of Quality in this section, refer to pp. 18-21 in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).

Indicators of Quality

Evidence- Give specific examples.

Rating: (Reviewers only.)

1. Lessons are thoughtfully structured and support the teacher in leading the class through the learning paths at hand, with active participation by all students in their own learning and in the learning of their classmates.

Evidence-
Point of use instructional guidance embedded in each lesson for identifying common misconceptions
Focus portion of each lesson begins with a previously unsolved problem
Open resources-students are encouraged to explore, explain

(Reviewer only.)

Yes

No

2. The underlying design of the materials includes both problems and exercises. (In solving problems, students learn new mathematics, whereas in working exercises, students apply what they have already learned to build mastery.) Each problem or exercise has a purpose.
NOTE: This Criterion does not require that the problems and exercises be labeled as such.

Evidence-
Each unit contains a limited number of problems to introduce and develop new mathematical learning. Begins with Math Message, students share strategies, then follow-up. Open response allow students to solve non-routine problems and delve deeply into the SMP
Practice sessions include games to help provide to reinforce, mental math and fluency exercises build and maintain fluency

(Reviewer only.)

Yes

No

<p>3. Design of assignments is not haphazard: exercises are given in intentional sequences in order to strengthen students' mathematical understanding.</p>	<p>Evidence- Grade 4: Lesson 3-2 and 3-3 students use fraction circles and number lines to recognize and generate equivalent fractions, lesson 3-4 students create an algorithm Grade 4: Unit 5: fractions beginning with decomposition, then adding, moving into adding 10th and 100th which will move the students toward decimal work</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) _X_ Yes ____ No</p>
<p>4. There are separate teacher materials that support and reward teacher study including, but not limited to: discussion of the mathematics of the units and the mathematical point of each lesson as it relates to the organizing concepts of the unit, discussion on student ways of thinking and anticipating a variety of students responses, guidance on lesson flow, guidance on questions that prompt students thinking, and discussion of desired mathematical behaviors being elicited among students.</p>	<p>Evidence- Grade 4: pg 544 volume 2 teachers lesson guide, professional development notes are embedded to provide specific background information on a key aspect of the lesson; open response includes suggestions for setting expectations and opportunities for students to practice Digital resources are available to support teachers, videos from online, along with professional development resources Grade 4: Lesson 3-2 and 3-3 students use fraction circles and number lines to recognize and generate equivalent fractions, lesson 3-4 students create an algorithm</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) _X_ Yes ____ No</p>
<p>5. Manipulatives suggested in the materials are faithful representations of the mathematical objects they represent and are connected to written methods.</p>	<p>Evidence- Both concrete and student generated manipulatives are used Digital lessons use the evaluate feature found in digital lesson activities Grade 4: Lesson 3-2 and 3-3 students use fraction circles and number lines to recognize and generate equivalent fractions, lesson 3-4 students create an algorithm</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) _X_ Yes ____ No</p>
<p>6. Materials include a variety of curriculum-embedded assessments. Examples include pre-, formative, summative, and self-assessment resources.</p>	<p>Evidence- Pre assessments, a beginning of the unit assessment, formative assessments. Digital curriculum components provide feedback of individual students in order to impact instruction. Summative assessments for each unit Self assessments at the beginning of each Progress check lesson Readiness checks TE pg 543</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) _X_ Yes ____ No</p>
<p>7. Assessments contain aligned rubrics, answer keys, and scoring guidelines that provide sufficient guidance for interpreting student performance.</p>	<p>Evidence- Regular lessons contain daily assessment check in Unit progress check lessons begin with a table listing the content and practice standards assessed. Open Response Assessments—odd numbered units- address one or more content standards and one goal for mathematical practice Assessment handbook: rubrics sample student responses pg A23-34</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) _X_ Yes ____ No</p>

<p>8. Materials assess student proficiency using methods that are accessible and unbiased, including the use of course-level language in student prompts.</p>	<p>Evidence- Problems presented in context that are familiar to students, differentiation options provided for scaffolding and extensions Lesson 3-9 pg 92, prompts includes student appropriate language</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>9. Materials are carefully evaluated by qualified individuals, whose names are listed, in an effort to ensure freedom from mathematical errors and course-level appropriateness.</p>	<p>Evidence- External reviewers list on Title page Implementation Guide, materials are extensively field-tested by qualified teachers & University of Chicago</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>10. The visual design supports students in engaging thoughtfully with the subject. Navigation through the text is clear.</p>	<p>Evidence- Student materials are designed with font sizes and text density for the age of the child. Independent student work pages in the math journal, home links, and math masters, familiar icons refer students to specific reference book pages where they can find relevant helpful information.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>11. The materials engage parents in appropriate ways. For example, homework assignments in elementary grades, consist of routine problems, practice with getting answers, and fluency-building exercises that parents can easily support.</p>	<p>Evidence- Family letters for each unit include descriptions of math content, vocabulary, games, selected home-link answers (grade 4 math masters, page 91-96) Parent link online provide answers to FAQs and specific grade level information. Home Link, answer key pg 67-68</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

Reviewer IMET Evaluation Summary Title/Level: Everyday Math

Publisher: McGraw Hill School Edition LLC Copyright: 2016

ISBN: 978-0-02-141001-9

Reviewer ID # MH & DB Date Review Completed: March 8, 2016

Non-Negotiable Criteria- Each Non-Negotiable must be met in order for the Non-Negotiable Alignment Criteria to be met overall.

Non-Negotiable 1: Freedom from Obstacles to Focus

Meets

Does Not Meet

Non-Negotiable 2: Focus and Coherence

Meets

Does Not Meet

Non-Negotiable Overall:

Meets Does Not Meet

Alignment Criteria- Each Alignment Criterion must be met with a sufficient number of points in order for Alignment Criteria to be labeled as "Meets" overall. The more points the materials receive on the Alignment Criteria, the better they are aligned.

Alignment Criterion 1: Rigor and Balance

Points: 6 of 6 possible.

(Materials must receive at least 5 of 6 points to align.)

Meets

Does Not Meet

Alignment Criterion 2: Standards of Mathematical Practice

Points: 6 of 6 possible.

(Materials must receive at least 5 of 6 points to align.)

Meets

Does Not Meet

Alignment Criterion 3: Access to Standards for All Learners

Points: 6 of 6 possible.

(Materials must receive at least 5 of 6 points to align.)

Meets

Does Not Meet

Alignment Criteria Overall:

X Meets

Does Not Meet

If the materials meet both Non-Negotiables and relevant Alignment Criterion, they are aligned to the Shifts and major features of the Core Standards. the materials meet every Non-Negotiable and Alignment Criterion? Yes No

What are the specific areas of strength and weakness based on this evaluation? Publishers or others modifying or developing assessments can use this information to make improvements and/or to remedy gaps in the alignment of assessment materials.

Strengths: Student generated manipulatives, SMP are embedded throughout the lessons, differentiation/scaffolding is readily available, Home Links with family letters and help; self-assessments

Weakness: hard to know when working on major or supporting works quickly, supporting work may cover too much time, lattice multiplication

