

# 2015-16 Mathematics Interim Review Recommendation & Summary

Publisher Name:	McGraw-Hill School Education, LLC
Title:	Everyday Math
ISBN #	978-0-02-143073-4 TE Vol. 1
Grade Level(s) or Course:	Grade 6
Reviewer ID:	LS, JH

## RECOMMENDED AS:

    X     **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**-Everyday Math focuses on building a deep framework of 6th grade standards while spending great lengths developing student reasoning and problem-solving skills.

**COHERENCE**-The development of the Standards is consistent with the Major Works of 6th grade. Unduly emphasis is placed on scaling to deepen understanding of ratios and proportions. Scaling is a 7th grade application standard.

**RIGOR**-The text provides rich discussion questions, high level conceptual problems, open-ended re-engagement tasks that have many entry points and allow students to explore the mathematics of the standards.

**CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING**-There is a strong component of conceptual understanding that asks students to discuss and construct viable arguments, use a variety of models, and solve real world problems.

**MATHEMATICAL PRACTICES**-The textbook instructs teachers and students about the habits of mind associated with the mathematical practices.

**ACCESSIBILITY OF STANDARDS TO ALL STUDENTS**-A mix of instructional strategies is evident in the program. The sequencing of tasks, problems, and questions provide for growing understanding and fluency.

**OTHER:** There are several games in the manipulative that are extremely beneficial to the program.

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

**Publisher:** McGraw-Hill School Education, LLC

**Title of Material:** Everyday Math Grade 6

**Author:** Bell, et al

**ISBN #:** 978-0-02-143073-4<sup>TE</sup> Vol 1 **Copyright** 2016

**Reviewer ID:** LS, JH

**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 solving  
MATH thinking intellectual creativity  
21st solutions students critical media information  
curiosity formulation problem  
solution systems identification

# 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).

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 criterion 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.)**

**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 NN2.)

**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 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.

**Metric NN1A:**

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

**Evidence-**

A review of the assessments provided for the textbook reveals all content related to the work of 6th grade. Standards from upper grades are not assessed.

(Reviewer only.)

     X      Meets

- 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.)

Probability, including chance, likely outcomes, and probability models are not included.

Similarity, congruence, and geometric transformations are not included.

\_\_\_ Does Not Meet

(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.**

\_\_\_x\_\_\_ Meets

\_\_\_ Does Not Meet

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.

**Strengths/Weaknesses:**

Standards are broken down to create a framework for students' learning. Lessons build on prior knowledge from previous lessons in the curriculum. There are multiple opportunities for students to explore and discover and then discuss their strategies. The assessments reflect only 6th grade CCSS content.



# 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](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

#### 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.

#### Evidence-

The first seven units are directly linked with the Major work of the 6th grade. The authors seemed to develop the units around the four critical areas identified in the CCSS. The last unit includes lessons related to scaling. This topic is suggested for 7th grade in the Progression document for Ratios and Proportional Reasoning.

(Reviewer only.)

\_\_\_x\_\_\_ Meets

\_\_\_ Does Not Meet/

Insufficient Evidence



<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>  The four supporting clusters are integrated throughout the units. There is a spiraling review and reinforcement of computation with multi-digit numbers. The problems related to area, surface area, and volume require computation with fractions and decimals. The unit on statistics introduces students to multiple models and leads to work with number lines and integers and eventually to the coordinate plane.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet/  <b>Insufficient Evidence</b></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>  Content from previous grades is used daily as a warm-up activity and is related to the 6th grade content in the lesson. The 6th grade content is faithful to the progressions document. This is particularly evident in the lessons related to ratios and proportional reasoning. The textbook extends proportional reasoning to ideas about scaling in the last unit. This topic's placement at the end of the textbook comes after significant work with ratio tables. This would be an appropriate extension for higher achieving students. Scaling is also present, along with similarity of rectangles, in the second unit. Again, this could be used for higher achieving students. Similarity is not included in the assessment.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet/  <b>Insufficient Evidence</b></p>
<p><b>Metric NN2D:</b>  <b>Materials give all students extensive work with on-grade-level problems.</b></p> <p><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.</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b>  Each lesson includes differentiation opportunities for all students. Readiness activities of each unit addresses grade level standards in a simplified manner for learners who need additional scaffolding. See Unit 3 Lesson 8 which has students complete a hands-on activity dropping pennies and writing out ratios followed by a discussion. The Enrichment activities for each</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet/  <b>Insufficient Evidence</b></p>

For context, read Criterion #5b in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).

unit address grade level standards for students who need a challenge. Games that practice grad-level problems are included in the manipulative kit for additional practice for all leveled learners. There are also differentiation tips for the teacher in the margins of the teacher edition. The teacher edition also includes information about adjusting the assessments to provide appropriate scaffolding. In all cases, this is consistent with on grade level work. Problems and tasks that encourage higher achieving students to go deeper are also provided.

**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).

**Evidence-**

The Warm Up for each lesson asks students to complete review problems that the 6th grade lesson will build on. Unit 3 Lesson 6 Exploring Long Division with Decimals builds on students previous knowledge of multiplying decimals and long division with whole numbers. Each lesson begins with a Readiness Activity that sets the foundation for linking new learning with old learning. This is often in the form of a game. For example, the student s play Fraction Capture to review equivalent fractions and renaming fractions and mixed numbers before dividing fractions with common denominators. The "within grade" level spiral tracker lets a teacher know exactly where a student is relative to mastery of the standard. Less attention is given to how a progression continues to develop across grade levels. Practice problems on fifth grade skills.

**Evidence-**

The responsibility for the current year is explicit and specific as shown in the Unit Overview, Lesson Overview, Spiral Trace, and the Focus Clusters for each lesson. Previous grades' standards may be included in the Readiness activities and in the Spiral Trace. To see how mastery develops for all standards teachers are

**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

(Reviewer only.)

Meets

Does Not Meet/

Insufficient Evidence

(Reviewer only.)

Meets

Does Not Meet/

Insufficient Evidence

<p>both student and teacher materials.) Identify any content from previous grades and check whether it is identified as such.</p> <p>For context, read Criterion #5a in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p>directed to go online. Fifth grade content is clearly labeled as such in the Readiness activities. It takes careful reading to find other references to links with 5th grade work. For example, of the 8 lessons related to multiplication and division of fractions, 3 are focused on models the progression documents suggest for fifth grade. This is detailed in the Teacher Edition Mathematical Background: Content pages. To say that this look back is "clearly identified" is a stretch. It has to be assumed that the teacher will provide this information to the student as they are playing or doing the Readiness activities. The letters to the parents are an effective tool for helping parents understand how new learning will be connected to prior learning (5th grade).</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 NN2G:</b></p> <p><b>Materials include learning objectives that are visibly shaped by CCSSM cluster headings.</b></p> <p>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><b>Evidence-</b></p> <p>Learning objectives are not formally stated, but the teacher edition lifts language from the clusters so the teacher understands the focus. There is also a Spiral Snapshot to show how this lesson's focus fits in with the standard as a whole. The lessons are definitely linked to the clusters. Unit 5 Lesson 5 states the Focus Cluster: Solve real-world and mathematical problems involving area, surface area, and volume which is clearly aligned with 6.G.4. Unit 7 Lesson 5's Focus Cluster states "Understand ratio concepts and use ratio reasoning to solve problems" which is clearly aligned with 6.RP.3b</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Meets</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet/Insufficient Evidence</p>
<p><b>Metric NN2H:</b></p> <p><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>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</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b></p> <p>Problems and activities connect clusters where natural and important. Expressions and Equations are integrated throughout as students are asked regularly to supply an equation for application problems from multiple domains. Making Box Plots and Finding Interquartile Range is not included in the unit focusing on Statistics. Instead, this topic's introduction is</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Meets</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet/Insufficient Evidence</p>

clusters or problems. NOTE: An example of evaluating this Criterion might include looking at whether problems in grade 4 sometimes or often involve students applying their developing computational 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).

included after operating with fractions and percents. Surface area and volume problems require students to apply multiplication of decimals and fractions.

## 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.

(Reviewer only.)

\_\_\_x\_\_\_Meets

\_\_\_Does Not Meet

### Strengths/Weaknesses:

**Strength:** The standards are covered in a variety of strategies to meet the learning needs of below level and grade level students. The manipulative kit includes games that will allow students at all levels to deepen their conceptual understanding. Standards are clustered together where necessary. Previous grade level standards are included in the Readiness activities and Math Boxes. Teachers are referred to the textbook website for a full list of standard's development.

**Weakness:** The spiraling nature of this textbook makes it hard to understand the coherence without extensive study of the Math Background pages. To be effective with this textbook, a teacher would need to spend considerable time to ensure deep understanding of the math content.

## 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](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 ([achievethecore.org/focus](http://achievethecore.org/focus))
- Situation Types for the Operations in Word Problems ([achievethecore.org/situation-types](http://achievethecore.org/situation-types))
- From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides, student texts and workbooks

#### 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.

#### 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).

-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".)

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

2 Meets (2)

         Partially Meets (1)

         Does Not Meet (0)

Math Masters book: Using Ratios to Make Fruit Cups, students are asked to create a recipe that would taste the same as Recipe B, but uses more than 11 cups of fruit. Students have worked through several problems already and are familiar with Recipe B.

Math Masters book: Using Properties to Simplify Expressions, students are asked to create their own expressions using fractions as coefficients. Similar questions are found throughout.

**Evidence-**

The students are asked to use multiple models for ratios- ratio tables, pictures, and tape diagrams. They are asked to use related mathematical vocabulary and then the related symbols. The problems presented are contextual based and students are asked to translate the information in a representational model, words, and with ratio notation.

Unit 7 Assessment asks students to connect their learning of reading line graphs, plotting in the coordinate plane, and writing equations. Units are also developed with a spiral learning plan so students are reinforcing Idaho Core Standards from one unit to the next. For example: 6.RP.3d is introduced, practiced, and mastered across Unit 2 Lessons 11, 13, 15, Unit 3 Lessons 1, 7, Unit 5 Lessons 4, 10, 11, 13, and Unit 7 Lessons 5, 6, and 12. Similar spiral learning for all major works. Each lesson has "Math Boxes" in the student journal that reviews skills and concepts the students have already learned as well as "Preview Math Boxes" which focus student learning for upcoming concepts.

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 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.

**Metric AC1B:**

**The materials are designed so that students attain the fluencies and procedural skills required by the Standards.**

**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

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

(Reviewer only.)

2 Meets (2)



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.

**Evidence-**

6.RP.A Students are provided an opportunity to develop a conceptual understanding of ratios as they connect ratio language (on each, for, to per) with drawings and models. The teacher edition specifically explains the delay of the use of fraction notation. Students are asked to explain the difference between additive and multiplicative reasoning. There are opportunities for partner work as well as whole group instruction, with discussion questions provided. Tape diagrams and ratio tables are introduced. There is extensive use of MP3, MP4, and MP5. Pictures are used to aid in the development of equivalent ratios. Students are given tasks and problems but are not given specific directions with regard to operations of multiplication and division. Fractional notation is delayed until students have had some experiences with equivalent ratios.

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  $\frac{1}{5}$  and less than  $\frac{1}{4}$ ," or "if the divisor does not change and the dividend increases, what happens to the quotient?"

**Evidence-**

6.RP.A Rich discussion questions are provided throughout and the tasks are open so that there are multiple entry points. Students are asked to compare additive and multiplicative reasoning. Students are also asked to compare the advantages of different models. There are multiple opportunities in each Unit for students to deepen their conceptual learning.  
Unit 2 Cumulative Assessment #8 Create a dot plot with at least 5 data points. The maximum is 10. The balance point for the set of data needs to be 6, but none of the points can be located at 6.  
Unit 4 Cumulative Assessment #4 Name a number between each pair of numbers. 4a) 0.3 and 0.4 4b)  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{1}{3}$ .  
Unit 6 Challenge #2 Find three consecutive numbers whose sum is 90.  
Unit 6 Cumulative Assessment #1 Find two numbers between each pair of numbers.

<p>procedural. Use throughout the questions associated with this metric. Note some examples of Standards that call for procedural skill and fluency include:</p> <p>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</p> <p>For context, read Criterion #4b in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013).</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>_____Partially Meets (1)</p> <p>_____Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p><b>Evidence-</b></p> <p>The procedural practices from the Major Works are interwoven with conceptual learning throughout each Unit. 6.NS.B.2 &amp; 6.NS.B.3 In the development of the long division algorithm, students are asked to compare the traditional algorithm with partial quotients. This work is preceded by finding quotients using mental math. Scaffolding is suggested to support struggling learners. This skill is part of the spiraling nature of the textbook and will appear in many homework assignments throughout the year. Fluency with decimal operations reflects the same pattern-related warm up with whole numbers; a focus on estimation, and then work toward the traditional algorithms. There is heavy reliance on number sense.</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b></p> <p>The bulk of the mental math problems are part of the warm up activity. This textbook relies on distributed review and problems requiring efficient algorithms are included throughout the year in homework and practice.</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>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></p> <p>The text provides sufficient practice to support fluency standards as evident in warm-ups, below level differentiation lessons, and homework assignments.</p>	<p>The content is taught through contextual based problems so that students work with engaging applications when introduced to a topic and also in</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:</p> <p>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>Metric AC1C:</b></p> <p><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>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.</p>	<p></p>

2\_\_ Meets (2)  
 \_\_\_ Partially Meets (1)  
 \_\_\_ Does Not Meet (0)

more formal applications. For example, the students work with ratio tables in a variety of contexts and then complete an independent "paint mixing" task. The same models for ratios and proportional reasoning are used in application tasks involving unit rates. The same is true for percent problems.

**Evidence-**  
 Two day open response and re-engagement tasks are provided as non-routine problems that engage students in problem solving. Students are asked to solve real world problems in assessments, in homework, and in daily practice.

**Evidence-**  
 The Major Work of the grade is represented in application problems. The is particularly evident in the ratio problems and the percent problems. Division problems precede ratio problems to provide a natural connection. In the same manner, interquartile ranges are introduced after work with fractions and division. The statistical problems are directly tied to contexts familiar to and important to 6th grade students.

**Evidence-**  
 Models are directly provided and students are asked to make sense of the model. Later, students are asked to make and use models that make sense to them given a context. MP4 is evident in all introductory lessons.

**How to Find 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.B  
 For context, read Criterion #4c in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K–8 (Spring 2013).

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 Types for the Operations in Word Problems

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.

(Reviewer only.)  
 \_\_\_ 6\_\_ Meets  
 \_\_\_ Does Not Meet

**Alignment Criterion 1:  
 Rigor and Balance**  
**Materials must reflect the balances in the Standards and help students meet the Standards' rigorous expectations.**

AC1 Material must earn at least 5 out of 6 points to meet this Alignment Criterion. If materials earn more 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.

**Strengths/Weaknesses:**  
Strength: The curriculum is focused on the Major Works with ample opportunities for students to explore strategies and deepen their conceptual understanding.  
Conceptual understanding and application metrics are particularly strong for this textbook.

Weakness: Some teachers would be concerned that there are not enough opportunities for procedural fluency to develop.

## 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](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

#### 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><b>Metric A :</b>  <b>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.</b></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.  For context, read Criterion #8 in the Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Grades K-8 (Spring 2013).</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b>  Mathematical practices are clearly present throughout the curriculum. The Practices are marked in the Unit Organizer, in the Mathematical Background: Practices, and the beginning of each Lesson. But it doesn't stop there, throughout the lessons in the Teacher's Edition the practices are marked to allow teachers to focus different parts of the lesson on the Practices where necessary. Unit 2 Lesson 1 largely focuses on MP6: attend to precision, MP7: look for and make use of structure whereas Unit 2 Lesson 5 largely focuses on MP2: reason abstractly and quantitatively, MP3: construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others. Unit 3 Lesson 11 focuses on MP2: reason abstractly and quantitatively and MP4: model with mathematics. All practices are represented sufficiently throughout the curriculum, not only the Practices mentioned.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)  ___ <b>2</b> ___ <b>Meets (2)</b>  ___ <b>Partially Meets (1)</b>  ___ <b>Does Not Meet (0)</b></p>
<p><b>Metric AC2B:</b>  <b>Materials attend to the full meaning of each practice Standard.</b></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).  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><b>Evidence-</b>  Sufficient time and focus are given to the Mathematical Practices throughout the year. The Practice Standards are integrated in each lesson, with each standard the focus at different points in the unit. The assessments require students to demonstrate the Practice Standards. Unit 2 Lesson 1 largely focuses on MP6: attend to precision, MP7: look for and make use of structure whereas Unit 2 Lesson 5 largely focuses on MP2: reason abstractly and quantitatively, MP3: construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others. Unit 3 Lesson</p>	<p>Use the questions for Metric 2B to evaluate Metric 2B. Record evidence for each question and rate Metric 2B.  (Reviewer only.)  ___ <b>2</b> ___ <b>Meets (2)</b>  ___ <b>Partially Meets (1)</b>  ___ <b>Does Not Meet (0)</b></p>

<p>Do the materials treat the practice Standards as developing across grades or grade bands? Are the practice Standards in early grades appropriately simple? Do they display an arc of growing sophistication across the grades?</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>11 focuses on MP reason abstractly and quantitatively and MP4: model with mathematics. All practices are represented sufficiently throughout the curriculum, not only the Practices mentioned.</p> <p><b>Evidence-</b> The Student Reference Book shows the student what the Practice Standard looks like at the intermediate level. It is difficult to determine if there is a growing arc of sophistication across the grades.</p> <p><b>Evidence-</b> The Mathematical Practices are outlined in the Teacher's Edition Unit organizers as well as the Mathematical Background sections which are present in all units. Alignment is accurate.</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.)</p> <p><u>  2  </u> Meets (2)</p> <p><u>      </u> Partially Meets (1)</p> <p><u>      </u> Does Not Meet (0)</p>
<p><b>Metric AC2C:</b> <b>Materials support the Standards' emphasis on mathematical reasoning.</b> 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>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> Reasoning is at the heart of the instruction in the textbook. Students are routinely asked to explain their thinking. Students critique the reasoning of others as they engage in the Open Response and Re-engagement activities. Students are tasked to construct viable arguments and critiquing the arguments of others throughout the curriculum. Unit 1 Lesson 9, Unit 2 Lesson 8, Unit 3 Lesson 3, Unit 4 Lesson 8, Unit 5 Lesson 5, Unit 6 Lesson 4, Unit 7 Lesson 7, Unit 8 Lesson 7</p> <p><b>Evidence-</b> Students are asked to provide models and representations and to explain each. They are taught how to provide a mathematical argument through conjectures and explanations of reasoning. They are asked to critique the reasoning of others as they analyze student errors. Every Unit has an open ended lesson that spans at least 2 days and</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>asks students to generate patterns and models on day 1. Day 2 focuses on examining their classmates' work, discussing, and revising their work.</p>	
<p><b>Evidence-</b> Every unit includes a list of vocabulary in the Mathematical Background section at the beginning of the unit and are expected to use the vocabulary as they explain their reasoning. There are ample opportunities for students to discuss and defend mathematics with the teacher and with other students. Models and representations are objects used to explain reasoning.</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>(Reviewer only.) <u>  6  </u> Meets  <u>  </u> Does Not Meet</p> <p><b>Strengths/Weaknesses:</b> The Mathematical Practices have a strong presence throughout the curriculum and all Practices are adequately represented and built on. This textbook instructs teachers and students about the habits of mind associated with the mathematical practices. It also assesses the student's performance of the Practice Standards.</p>	<p><b>Alignment Criterion 2: Standards for Mathematical Practice</b></p> <p><b>Materials must demonstrate authentic connections between content Standards and practice Standards.</b></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>Before moving to Alignment Criterion 3, record the final Meets or Does Not Meet rating in the Evaluation Summary.</p>	<p><b>Alignment Criterion 3: Access to the Standards for All Students</b></p>
<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><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.">http://www.</a>)</li> </ul>	

**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.

**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.**

**How to Find the Evidence:**  
Evaluate teacher and student materials, paying attention to supports offered for special populations.

corestandards.org/w...tent/uploads/Math\_Publishers\_Criteria\_K-8\_Spring\_3\_FINAL1.pdf)

• From the materials being evaluated: teacher guides, student texts and workbooks

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.

Reviewer only.)

\_\_\_2\_\_\_ Meets (2)

\_\_\_Partially Meets (1)

\_\_\_Does Not Meet (0)

**Evidence-**

Every lesson has differentiated instruction activities for English Language Learners and other special populations. the textbook identifies specific points in instruction where support will be needed for English Language Learners. Often this is based on providing visual information. Reading supports is also suggested throughout and the problems are deliberately presented in simple language. Common misconceptions are identified in the teacher edition along with strategies to address the misconceptions. The games provided in the manipulative kit allow all special populations above and below grade level to practice and deepen their understanding of the Standards on their level.

**Evidence-**

The curriculum is laced with spiral learning that allows appropriate scaffolding and support for all learners. Each lesson begins with three levels of Readiness activities. Often these are engaging games from the manipulative kit. Students work in pairs and as a whole on problems and homework or Math Boxes provide independent practice. During instruction, there are notes in the teacher edition for adjusting the activity, addressing misconceptions and the development of academic vocabulary. Games provide further opportunities for differentiation and there are Assessment Check-ins which inform the teacher about needed support or scaffolding. The spiral/distributed review allows for the gradual removal of supports.

Reviewer only.)

\_\_\_2\_\_\_ Meets (2)

\_\_\_Partially Meets (1)

\_\_\_Does Not Meet (0)

**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.**

**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><b>Metric A:</b> Design 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><b>Evidence-</b> There are a variety of lesson strategies used throughout each lesson identified in the teacher's manual including whole group, small group, partner, or independent work. Additionally the questions provided are consistently higher order and there are multiple opportunities for checking for understanding through models, open ended tasks, questioning, and written responses.</p>	<p>Reviewer only.)          ___ 2 ___ Meets (2)          ___ Partially Meets (1)          ___ Does Not Meet (0)</p>
---	---	---

<p><b>Alignment Criterion 3:</b>  <b>Access to the Standards for All Students</b>  <b>Materials must provide supports for English Language Learners and other special populations.</b></p> <p>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.)</p> <p>Move to the Evaluation Summary and record the final Meets or Does Not Meet rating .</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)          ___ 6 ___ Meets          ___ Does Not Meet</p> <p><b>Strengths/Weaknesses:</b>  <b>Strengths:</b> The program includes a variety of instructional strategies. The sequencing of tasks, problems, and questions provide for growing understanding and fluency.</p>
---	--

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).

<p><b>Indicators of Quality</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Evidence- Give specific examples.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence-</b>          Each unit has a sufficient guide for the teacher including the Unit Organizer: Standards, Mathematical Practices, Contents (Lessons), list of materials for each lesson, Problem Solving, list of Assessment and Differentiation, as well as</p>	<p>Rating: (Reviewers only.)          (Reviewer only.)          ___ x ___ Yes          ___ No</p>
---	---	---

<p>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.</p>	<p>Ongoing Practices and how the Games provided can be used for the unit, Mathematical Background of standards and practices, and a Spiral Trace of Standards that are reviewed compared with Standards that are reviewed lessons in each unit broken down into Warm-Up activities, Focus work and class instruction, Practice opportunities for students in class, and conclude with Math Boxes (aka homework) and a Home Link. Students are consistently engaged through problem solving. The questions strategies provided lead to student engagement and problems/tasks have multiple entry points.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>3. Design of assignments is not haphazard: exercises are given in intentional sequences in order to strengthen students' mathematical understanding.</p>	<p>Evidence-  Problems and exercises are given in the Focus portion of the lessons as well as in the Practices section where students turn to their Math Journal and Math Masters books. The introduction of ratios provides an example of learning new mathematics through problem solving. The lessons associated with operations with decimals provide examples of working exercises to build mastery.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> 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-  Overall, the approach is systematic and follows a logical sequence. The sequence in all lessons is carefully designed to build student understanding and fluency. The distributed review and Readiness activities are intentionally sequenced as well.</p> <p>Evidence-  Lessons provide mathematical background on the content taught, "possible student responses" and questions to guide discussion. questions are provided to guide student thinking along with strategies to address misconceptions. Specific points when students should demonstrate the Mathematical Practices are identified.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> 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> The manipulatives provided are aligned with the mathematical focus of the unit. Online manipulatives are also provided. Students are asked to connect representations with written methods.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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> In addition to frequent teacher observations, every lesson offers an Assessment Check-In to gauge students' performance on one or more of the standards. The textbook contains the identified curriculum embedded assessments. The Assessment Handbook offers a student Self Assessment, Assessment with procedural and conceptual problems, Challenge Assessment with open ended questions, and a Cumulative Unit Assessment. Additionally there are Beginning-of-Year, Mid-Year, and End-of-Year Assessments each with an outlining of goal Standards that are covered in the assessment.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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> Rubrics and scoring guidelines with student samples are included in the Assessment Handbook, but the rubrics are generic. Answer keys for the Assessment Check-In questions and Summative Assessments are available in the Teacher Edition of the textbook. Assessment of the Mathematical Practices is provided along with assessment of the math content.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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> Questions that assess student performance model the language in the textbook.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><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> Evaluators, both from the project as well as outside, are included are listed on the copyright page of the Teacher's' Edition.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>

<p>10. The visual design supports students in engaging thoughtfully with the subject. Navigation through the text is clear.</p>	<p><b>Evidence-</b> The Student Journal is simple and clear. Models are simple and students are asked to provide their own models.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">___ No</p> <p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p>___x___ Yes</p> <p>___ 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><b>Evidence-</b> The Math Masters student book includes a parent letter for each unit which includes an outline of the text content, an overview of data displays, vocabulary, do-anytime activities, games to play at home, and a guide to helping your child with homework including an answer key to homework problems. The Student Reference Book will also serve as a "Parent" Reference Book.</p>	<p>(Reviewer only.)</p> <p>___x___ Yes</p> <p>___ No</p>



Reviewer ID # LS, JH Date Review Completed: 03/08/16

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

<b>Non-Negotiable 1: Freedom from Obstacles to Focus</b>	<b>Non-Negotiable 2: Focus and Coherence</b>
<u>  </u> x <u>  </u> Meets <u>  </u> Does Not Meet	<u>  </u> x <u>  </u> Meets <u>  </u> 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.

<b>Alignment Criterion 1: Rigor and Balance</b>	<b>Alignment Criterion 2: Standards of Mathematical Practice</b>	<b>Alignment Criterion 3: Access to Standards for All Learners</b>
Points: <u>  </u> 6 <u>  </u> of 6 possible. (Materials must receive at least 5 of 6 points to align.) <u>  </u> x <u>  </u> Meets <u>  </u> Does Not Meet	Points: <u>  </u> 6 <u>  </u> of 6 possible. (Materials must receive at least 5 of 6 points to align.) <u>  </u> x <u>  </u> Meets <u>  </u> Does Not Meet	Points: <u>  </u> 6 <u>  </u> of 6 possible. (Materials must receive at least 5 of 6 points to align.) <u>  </u> x <u>  </u> Meets <u>  </u> Does Not Meet

**Alignment Criteria Overall:**

   x (18/18)    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 Core Standards. Do the materials meet every Non-Negotiable and Alignment Criterion?   x   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:**

Curriculum is well developed and aligned to Common Core State Standards covering a variety of problems and strategies both procedural and conceptual. The text provides great opportunity for teachers to use student thinking to develop conceptual understanding. Student reasoning plays a key role throughout the textbook. Teachers are equipped with a variety of materials and support to teach the lessons. The Teacher's Edition includes a chart of the Standards and which lesson they are covered, Unit Organizer which further breaks down the lessons taught and the Standards included, a Spiral Trace of review and new concept lessons, and a breakdown of the Mathematical Practices for the each lesson. Materials are listed at the beginning of each lesson. The Manipulative Kit is very extensive, versatile and adaptive to a variety of lessons and situations. There are math games included in the Kit that are accessible for all levels of learners. The Student Reference Book is not consumable and focuses on student-led learning. The Student Math Journal and Math Masters books are well organized with parent letters and strategies to use at home.

**Weaknesses:**

The Student Math Journal and Math Masters books are consumable. Some applications are actually in the 7th grade standards: scaling is used to develop ideas about proportional reasoning and this is a specific 7th grade application.