

# 2015-16 Mathematics Interim Review Recommendation & Summary

Publisher Name:	McGraw Hill School Education, LLC
Title:	Every Day Math Grade 5
ISBN #	978-0-02-143068
Grade Level(s) or Course:	Grade 5
Reviewer ID:	DBMH

## 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~~ use a larger portion of time than necessary generally materials focus on Major Work of the grade.

### COHERENCE-

Domains and clusters are clearly ~~focused~~ stated at the beginning of each unit and lesson and address more than one standard & math practice for each lesson.

### RIGOR-

Students continually work on fluency applying that to real-world problems embedded in multi-step word problems and open-responses.

### CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING-

Students engage in content by solving contextual problems and apply concepts learned in earlier grades & lessons.

### MATHEMATICAL PRACTICES-

Mathematical practices are integrated and explicitly tied to all activities.

### 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 described 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 5

**Author:** Bell et al

**ISBN #:** 978-0-02-143068      **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 skills  
communication solving  
MATH thinking intellectual  
creativity  
21st Century students  
curiosity solutions  
formulation media information  
solution 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](http://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](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](http://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](http://www.achievethecore.org/focus)), the Supporting and Additional work, how the content fits into the progressions in the Standards ([www.achievethecore.org/progressions](http://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).

# 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](http://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](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](http://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](http://www.achievethecore.org/focus)), the Supporting and Additional work, how the content fits into the progressions in the Standards ([www.achievethecore.org/progressions](http://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 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.





**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-**

**\*\* Assessment- though standards are tested Unit 4, pg 33 assessment handbook- not a standard for 5<sup>th</sup> grade**



- 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**

**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.**

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.

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 NIN2.)

**Evidence- Give specific examples.**

**Required Materials**

- Common Core State Standards for Mathematics ([www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math\\_Standards.pdf](http://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\\_FINAL1.pdf](http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf))
- From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides and all assessment components

**Rating: (Reviewer only.)**

**Rating this Criterion:**

Non-Negotiable 1 is rated as Meets or Does Not Meet.  
 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.

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.



**Non-Negotiable 1: Materials must reflect the content architecture of the Standard, 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.

(Reviewer only.)

Meets

Does Not Meet

**Strengths/Weaknesses:**

Weakness: assessing to thousands-not a standard

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

**Directions for Non-Negotiable 2**

**Focus and Coherence**



<p><b>Non-Negotiable 2: Focus and Coherence</b></p> <p><b>Materials must focus coherently on the Major Work of the grade in a way that is consistent with the progressions in the Standards.</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Metric NN2A:</b> <b>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.</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b> 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)</p>	<p><b>Required Materials</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (<a href="http://corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards.pdf">http://corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards.pdf</a>)</li> <li>• Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013) (<a href="http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf">http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf</a>)</li> <li>• Focus by Grade Level for the grade being evaluated (<a href="http://www.achievethecore.org/focus">www.achievethecore.org/focus</a>)</li> <li>• From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides, student texts and workbooks</li> </ul>	<p><b>Rating this Criterion:</b> Non-Negotiable 2 is rated as Meets or <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Meet.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Evidence-</b> Table of contents and publishers comments state 98% on major works</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet/ Insufficient Evidence</p>	





<p><b>Metric NN2B:</b>  <b>Supporting work, where present, enhances focus and coherence simultaneously by also engaging students in the Major Work of the grade.</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  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><b>Evidence-</b>  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:   <b>Grade 5: 5MD.1 is a supporting cluster. Lesson 6-3 students convert metric measurements (5. MD.1) in the context of solving real-world multi-step problems (5.NBT.2)</b>  <b>6 of 8 units are major work.</b>  <b>Note: unit 4 and 7 have large sections that are not part of the major work</b></p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)   ___X___Meets   ___Does Not Meet/  Insufficient Evidence</p>
<p><b>Metric NN2C:</b>  <b>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.</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  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><b>Evidence-</b>  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   Spiral tracer (internet) doesn't have connection to previous grade, teacher edition EM1-9 only discussed grade level standards, not previous</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)   ___X___Meets   ___Does Not Meet/  Insufficient Evidence</p>



<p><b>Metric NN2D:</b>  <b>Materials give all students extensive work with on-grade-level problems.</b>  <b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  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><b>Evidence-</b>  Readiness activities- are students who need scaffolding for the main tasks. Extra practice provides all students with meaningful practice of grade-level content from the lesson  Note: no separate ELL components in print, but is online  Each lesson has embedded ELL scaffolding</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)  _X_ Meets  ___ Does Not Meet/  <b>Insufficient Evidence</b></p>
<p><b>Metric NN2E:</b>  <b>Materials relate on-grade-level concepts explicitly to prior knowledge from earlier grades.</b>  <b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  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><b>Evidence-</b>  Grade 5: Unit 3 organizer states "students build on fraction concepts from previous grades to understand fractions as division" The language reflects the language of the relevant Grade 5 cluster heading: Apply and extend previous understandings of multiplication and division to multiply and divide fractions.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)  _X_ Meets  ___ Does Not Meet/  <b>Insufficient Evidence</b></p>
<p><b>Metric NN2F:</b>  <b>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.</b>  <b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  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><b>Evidence-</b>  Lessons and activities contain minimal amounts of materials from earlier grades-clearly identified as previous standards  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  Grade 5: multiplying of fractions begins with review of multiplying by whole numbers to help bridge concept</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)  _X_ Meets  ___ Does Not Meet/  <b>Insufficient Evidence</b></p>



<p><b>Metric NN2G:</b>  <b>Materials include learning objectives that are visibly shaped by CCSSM cluster headings.</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  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><b>Evidence-</b>  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  Table of contents match objectives- but no specific mention to the terminology of "expressions"</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><b>X_ Meets</b></p> <p><b>Does Not Meet/ Insufficient Evidence</b></p>
<p><b>Metric NN2H:</b>  <b>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.</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  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><b>Evidence-</b> 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 5: Lesson 3-3 students explore situations where it makes sense to report remainders as the fractions, connecting standards from the 2 domains: 5.NBT.6 and 5.NF3</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><b>X_ Meets</b></p> <p><b>Does Not Meet/ Insufficient Evidence</b></p>



<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><u>  </u> X_ Meets</p> <p><u>  </u> Does Not Meet</p> <p><b>Strengths/Weaknesses:</b>  Weakness: ELL scaffolding  Strengths: organization at the beginning of units allows teacher knowledge of clusters and domains being taught</p>	<p><b>Non-Negotiable 2: Focus and Coherence</b></p> <p>Materials must focus coherently on the Major Work of the grade in a way that is consistent with the progressions in the Standards.</p> <p>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.)</p> <p>Before moving to Alignment Criterion 1, record the final Meets or Does Not Meet rating in the Evaluation Summary.</p>
<p>Now continue by evaluating the Alignment Criterion 1 for Rigor and Balance.</p>	
<p><b>Directions for Alignment Criterion 1</b></p> <p><b>Rigor and Balance</b></p>	
<p><b>Rating this Criterion:</b>  Alignment Criterion 1 is rated as Meets or Does Not Meet.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Required Materials</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (<a href="http://corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards.pdf">http://corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards.pdf</a>)</li> <li>Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013) (<a href="http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf">http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf</a>)</li> <li>Focus by Grade Level for the grade being evaluated (<a href="http://achievethecore.org/focus">achievethecore.org/focus</a>)</li> <li>Situation Types for the Operations in Word Problems (<a href="http://achievethecore.org/situation-types">achievethecore.org/situation-types</a>)</li> <li>From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides, student texts and workbooks</li> </ul> <p><b>Alignment Criterion 1: Rigor and Balance</b></p> <p>Materials must reflect the balances in the Standards and help students meet the Standards' rigorous expectations.</p> <p>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.</p>





<p><b>Metric AC1A:</b>  <b>The materials support the development of students' conceptual understanding of key mathematical concepts, especially where called for in specific content Standards or cluster headings.</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  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</p> <p>Clusters or Standards grouped by parentheses are closely connected and could be analyzed together.</p> <p>For context, read Criterion #4a in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>-Choose a cluster/Standard from the Major Work that is aligned to each aspect of rigor and use 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".)</p>	<p>Use the questions for AC Metric 1A to evaluate Metric 1A. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 1A.</p> <p><u>  </u> <b>x</b> <u>  </u> <b>Meets (2)</b></p> <p><u>  </u> <b>Partially Meets (1)</b></p> <p><u>  </u> <b>Does Not Meet (0)</b></p>
<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b>  Each lesson features high-quality conceptual problems as in the Open Response/Reengagement  Grade 5: Open response Lesson 1-3 Quit Area-must explain their reasoning and the others reasons (critique)  Unit 5: 4 lessons on add and subtract fractions, 2 lessons on dividing fractions by a whole, algorithm 2 lessons</p>	
<p>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>	<p><b>Evidence-</b>  Grade 5: Lesson 3-12 operations involving fractions in understanding fractions as division of the numerator by the denominator, applying this in lesson 5-12 when they consider real-world situations involving multiplication of fractions  Student Journal pgs 187, 233-235, 253  Daily Math messages</p>	



<p>Do the materials feature opportunities to identify correspondences across mathematical 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 <math>\frac{6}{2}</math>) 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><b>Evidence-</b> Grade 5: Lesson 1-5 through 1-11 beginning with comparing volume to finding volume with and algorithm Student Journal: pg 253, 221, 191</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 1B to evaluate Metric 1 B. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 1B.</p> <p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p>___X___ Meets (2)</p> <p>___ Partially Meets (1)</p> <p>___ Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p><b>Metric AC1B:</b> <b>The materials are designed so that students attain the fluencies and procedural skills required by the Standards.</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b> 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.NS.A, 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><b>Evidence-</b> Each lesson in grades 5 begin with a mental math and fluency exercise that develops fluency with basic facts and other skills that require automaticity, see lesson 6-2 Homework link also is geared towards fluency</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 <math>698 + 240</math> or the system <math>x + y = 1</math>, <math>2x + 2y = 3</math>. Examples of generic cases that require efficient algorithms might include the sum <math>8767 + 2286</math> or the system <math>6y + x = x + 3</math>, <math>-x = 1 + 2y</math>.</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> Lessons in grade 5 give opportunities for students to use algorithms-finding area and perimeters in grade 5 using algorithms, continuing practice with 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><b>Evidence-</b> Students apply their fluency with basic facts to learning algorithms. Using learning from 3<sup>rd</sup>, students begin using partial product, then move toward the traditional algorithm in 5<sup>th</sup> grade. Mental math and fluency games continue throughout the year (note) Lesson 2-4 multiplication algorithm- 20 practice problems, only appeared 6 in unit 3, 7 in unit 4, and none in unit 5</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 1C to evaluate Metric 1C. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 1C.</p> <p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Meets (2)</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially Meets (1)</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Does Not Meet (0)</b></p>
<p><b>Metric AC1C:</b> <b>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.</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b> 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.B</p> <p>For context, read Criterion #4c in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> Many opportunities to solve problems contextually-math boxes throughout grade level are contextual word problems. Grade 5: Lesson 2-3 contextual problems with estimating powers of 10 Student Journal pf 181, 231</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.</p>		



<p>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 Types for the Operations in Word Problems</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> Unit 8 is all application.</p>	
<p>Does modeling build slowly across K–8, with applications that are relatively simple in 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.</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> Lesson 5-13, students engage in content covering fractions by solving contextual problems involving operations with fractions. Students apply concepts learned in earlier lessons to fraction number stories involving division. Journal pg 10, 144, 243</p>	
<p>(Reviewer only.)  <input type="checkbox"/> Meets  <input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet</p> <p><b>Strengths/Weaknesses:</b> Thorough work within units to support standards with models as appropriate</p>		
<p><b>Alignment Criterion 1:</b>  <b>Rigor and Balance</b>  <b>Materials must reflect the balances in the Standards and help students meet the Standards' rigorous expectations.</b></p> <p>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.)</p>		
<p>Before moving to Alignment Criterion 2, record the final Meets or Does Not Meet rating in the Evaluation Summary.</p> <p><b>Directions for Alignment Criterion 2</b></p> <p><b>Standards for Mathematical Practice</b></p>		





## 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.

#### 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.**

#### 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.

For context, read Criterion #8 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](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](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](http://www.achievethecore.org/focus))
- From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides, student texts and workbooks

#### Evidence-

Lesson 6-8 engage with practice standards 8 and 5.NBT 7- they make generalizations about the relative size of decimal products and quotients, need to reason about the size of factors and make predictions about decimal products based on repeated reasoning.  
See TE 22-23, TE 512-513

#### Rating this Criterion

Alignment Criterion 2 is rated as Meet  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.

(Reviewer only.)

   **x**    **Meets (2)**

   **Partially Meets (1)**

   **Does Not Meet (0)**



<p><b>Metric AC2B:</b> Materials at _____ to the full meaning of each practice Standard.</p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b> 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><b>Evidence-</b> 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 Lesson 2-1, 2-10, 4-1</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 2B to evaluate Metric 2B. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 2B.  (Reviewer only.)  _x_ Meets (2)  ____ Partially Meets (1)  ____ Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p><b>Metric AC2C:</b> Materials support the Standards' emphasis on mathematical reasoning.</p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b> For context, read Criterion #10 in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> 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. Lesson 2-10 students use the relationship between multiplication and division to mentally divide multi-digit numbers. In lesson 2-1 students create representations using expanded forms of numbers to solve problems and in 4-1 they use place-value charts to explain patterns in numbers with decimals to the thousandths place. Student reference book pg 4-34</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 2C to evaluate Metric 2C. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 2C.  (Reviewer only.)  _x_ Meets (2)</p>
<p><b>Metric AC2B:</b> Materials at _____ to the full meaning of each practice Standard.</p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b> 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><b>Evidence-</b> 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 Lesson 2-1, 2-10, 4-1</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 2B to evaluate Metric 2B. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 2B.  (Reviewer only.)  _x_ Meets (2)  ____ Partially Meets (1)  ____ Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p><b>Metric AC2C:</b> Materials support the Standards' emphasis on mathematical reasoning.</p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b> For context, read Criterion #10 in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> Lesson 2-10 students use the relationship between multiplication and division to mentally divide multi-digit numbers. Embedded throughout lesson TE 24-25</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 2C to evaluate Metric 2C. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 2C.  (Reviewer only.)  _x_ Meets (2)</p>



	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Partially Meets (1)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Does Not Meet (0)</b></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><b>Evidence-</b> Students are encouraged to construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others while engaging with grade-level work 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 Games: bullseye, TE pg 120 uses partnership</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><b>Evidence-</b> Students are encouraged to construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others while engaging with grade-level work 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>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. 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><b>Evidence-</b> Students are encouraged to construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others while engaging with grade-level work 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 TE pgs 13, 259-260, 272, 679, 600, 472-473, 413</p>	



## Alignment Criterion 2: Standards for Mathematical Practice

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

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.)

(Reviewer only.)

\_\_x\_\_ Meets

\_\_\_ Does Not Meet

**Strengths/Weaknesses:**

Before moving to Alignment Criterion 3, record the final Meets or Does Not Meet rating in the Evaluation Summary.

## Alignment Criterion 3:

### Access to the Standards for All Students

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

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.

#### Required Materials:

- Common Core State Standards for Mathematics ([http://corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math\\_Standards.pdf](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](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

#### Rating this Criterion:

Alignment Criterion 3 is rated as Meets or Does Not Meet.

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).

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><b>Metric AC3A:</b>  <b>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.</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  Evaluate teacher and student materials, paying attention to supports offered for special populations.</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b>  Every lesson contains multiple specific suggestions for 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.  Lesson 6-3 the ELL support section suggests the use of sentence frames to help students make sense of the term convert, moving the between "convert" and "change", the common misconception note provides support for students who have trouble making sense of using a "What's my Rule" table to make measurement conversions, and the Adjusting the Activity note provides teachers with additional questions to ask students to help them make conversions in context.</p>	<p>Reviewer only.)  ___X___Meets (2)  ___Partially Meets (1)  ___Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p><b>Metric AC3B:</b>  <b>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.</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  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><b>Evidence-</b>  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.  Lesson 6-3 the ELL support section suggests the use of sentence frames to help students make sense of the term convert, moving the between "convert" and "change", the common misconception note provides support for students who have trouble making sense of using a "What's my Rule" table to make measurement conversions, and the Adjusting the Activity note provides teachers with additional questions to ask students to help them make conversions in context.</p>	<p>Reviewer only.)  ___X___Meets (2)  ___Partially Meets (1)  ___Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p><b>Metric AC3C:</b>  <b>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).</b></p> <p><b>How to Find the Evidence:</b>  Evaluate teacher materials, noting instructional approaches suggested for whole class and differentiated lessons and activities.</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b>  Every activity including the differentiation options provide one or more suggestions for possible instructional approaches including grouping suggestions  Lesson 3-14 students play Number Top-it to build their understanding of place value relationships and expanded form (5NBT1). Observations prompts are included along with discussion questions encouraging students to explain mathematical structures in their own words  Every lesson has an activity/game</p>	<p>Reviewer only.)  ___X___Meets (2)  ___Partially Meets (1)  ___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**

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.
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- Give specific examples.**

**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  
Math message encourages discussion and helping others reach solutions  
**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

**Rating: (Reviewers only.)**

(Reviewer only.)

Yes

No

(Reviewer only.)

Yes

No



<p><b>3. Design of assignments is not haphazard: exercises are given in intentional sequences in order to strengthen students' mathematical understanding.</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> Grade 5: unit 2 begins place value, moves through multiplication then division, and onto fractions and decimals, all incorporating place value Note: unit 4 and 7 have lessons that don't seem to "fit" within the unit</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) _X_ Yes _____ No</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> TE Unit organizer: pg 106-107, 440-443</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) _X_ Yes _____ No</p>
<p><b>5. Manipulatives suggested in the materials are faithful representations of the mathematical objects they represent and are connected to written methods.</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> Both concrete and student generated manipulatives are used Digital lessons use the evaluate feature found in digital lesson activities</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) _X_ Yes _____ No</p>
<p><b>6. Materials include a variety of curriculum-embedded assessments. Examples include pre-, formative, summative, and self-assessment resources.</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> 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 ( 7-14, 6-14) Readiness check pg 659 TE</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) _X_ Yes _____ No</p>
<p><b>7. Assessments contain aligned rubrics, answer keys, and scoring guidelines that provide sufficient guidance for interpreting student performance.</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> 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 (A23-33)</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.) _X_ Yes _____ No</p>



<p><b>8. Materials assess student proficiency using methods that are accessible and unbiased, including the use of course-level language in student prompts.</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> Problems presented in text that are familiar to students, differentiation options provided for scaffolding and extensions Grade 5: pg 313 Lessons include specific suggestions for grade level appropriate lessons (academic vocabulary)</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> External reviewers list on Title page Implementation Guide, materials are extensively field-tested by qualified teachers &amp; University of Chicago</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p><b>10. The visual design supports students in engaging thoughtfully with the subject. Navigation through the text is clear.</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> 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.)   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> Family letters for each unit include descriptions of math content, vocabulary, games, selected home-link answers (pg 27) Parent link online provide answers to FAQs and specific grade level information. Home Link pg 51, answer key pg 186</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>





Reviewer IMET Evaluation Summary Title/Level: Everyday Math Grade 5

Publisher: McGraw Hill School Education LLC Copyright: 2016

ISBN: 978-0-02-143068

Reviewer ID # \_\_\_\_\_ 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**

   x    Meets

   Does Not Meet

**Non- Negotiable 2: Focus and Coherence**

   x    Meets

   Does Not Meet

**Non-Negotiable Overall:**

   x    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.)

   x    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.)

   x    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.)

   x    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.

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

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

