



Evaluation Report

BAKER ■ EVALUATION ■ RESEARCH ■ CONSULTING

June, 2013

## HAWAII CURRICULUM MATERIALS REVIEW: EVALUATION REPORT

---

DUANE B. BAKER, Ed.D.



Duane Baker is the founder and president of Baker Evaluation, Research, and Consulting, Inc. (*The BERC Group*). Dr. Baker has a broad spectrum of public school educational and program experience, including serving as a high school classroom teacher, high school assistant principal, middle school principal, executive director for curriculum and instruction, and assistant superintendent. In addition, he has served as an adjunct instructor in the School of Education at Seattle Pacific University since 1996, where his emphasis has been Educational Measurement and Evaluation and Classroom Assessment.

Dr. Baker also serves as the Director of Research for the Washington School Research Center at Seattle Pacific University. He also serves as an evaluator for several organizations including the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Kauffman Foundation, College Success Foundation, Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, and many others.

Members of *The BERC Group* have K–20, experiences as teachers, counselors, psychologists, building administrators, district administrators, and college professors. The team is currently working on research and evaluation projects at the national, state, regional, district, school, classroom, and student levels in over 1000 schools nationally.



## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Identification of Materials.....	5
<b>Pre-Screening Evaluation Process</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Studying the standards. ....	8
Narrowing the field of instructional materials. ....	8
Assessment of vertical alignment of instructional materials. ....	8
Recommendation of materials to the Hawaii Curriculum Review Committee.....	8
<b>HIDOE Content Specialist Evaluation Process</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Math.....	10
English Language Arts.....	10
Summary of HCRC Procedures.....	10
<b>Hawaii Curriculum Review Committee Findings</b> .....	<b>13</b>
Math.....	13
English Language Arts.....	21
<b>Recommendations</b> .....	<b>26</b>
Math.....	26
English Language Arts.....	26

## Executive Summary

Hawaii is one of many states adopting a nation-wide set of academic standards. The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) were developed through an initiative that drew on the expertise of teachers, researchers, and content experts from across the country. The CCSS defines a “staircase” to college and career readiness, building on the best of previous state standards and evidence from international comparisons and domestic reports, and recommendations. The state of Hawaii also has an added focus of ensuring all students have access to CCSS-aligned “digital” curriculum materials.

In his 2013 State of the State address, the Hawaii State Governor further promoted the state’s Department of Education’s initiative to move (statewide) to common curricular materials on digital devices within three years. With a clear focus coming from the State, the Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) contracted The BERG Group, Inc. to help develop a list of recommended curriculum materials, including textbooks and programs that best support digital classroom instruction and assessment related to the CCSS for mathematics and for English language arts (ELA).

Over a one-year time frame, The BERG Group led a multi-phase process that analyzed curriculum materials. The BERG Group conducted an initial screening of 57 math textbook/programs and 40 ELA textbook/programs. The purpose of the initial screening was to determine whether programs met non-negotiable requirements set by the state of Hawaii. State officials relied heavily upon the work of the Dana Center and the Common Core State Standard Publisher’s Criteria to set these requirements. Of those reviewed during the initial screening process, 23 mathematics and 16 ELA programs went through a full evaluation by The BERG Group. The purpose of the full BERG evaluation was to narrow the number of programs that would move on to the next level of analysis by determining the extent to which the programs were aligned with Common Core content and pedagogical (instructional) standards. Programs were scored and rank-ordered.

As a result of the BERG analysis, 12 mathematics programs and 7 ELA programs were referred to the Hawaii Curriculum Review Committee (HCRC) for further evaluation. Both the math and the ELA HCRC consisted of teachers, administrators, instructional coaches, and other content experts. The committees reviewed all 19 programs recommended by The BERG Group. During the analyses, the HCRC evaluated instructional alignment, content alignment, overall impressions and digital capacity.

To mitigate the possibility of “group think” developing and/or rater pre-knowledge bias influencing overall outcomes of the evaluation, the analyses averaged all group (grade-level and standards) responses into a single Overall Evaluation Score (OES) for each program, so any scoring extremes would be mitigated. ELA analysis generated three criteria scores that were averaged together into the OES. Math analysis generated four criteria scores that were averaged together into the OES. Math had four criteria because of the explicit pedagogical standards contained in the CCSS (8 Standards for Mathematical Practice). The ELA Pedagogical Shifts were addressed along with the analysis of digital and other support materials (Textbook Overview).

All analyses were conducted using a 4-point scale. An OES of 3.0 or higher was recommended for further consideration for adoption. The programs that met the 3.0 or higher OES were: ELA K- 6 *Wonders*, 6-12 *SpringBoard*, and math 6-8 *Carnegie Math*. No K-5 or 9-12 math programs met the 3.0 minimum OES for advancement or further consideration. Specific recommendations are provided in the report.

## Methodology

### Identification of Materials

The Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) provided The BERC Group with a list of 57 textbook/programs for mathematics and 40 textbook/programs for consideration during the initial publisher review in English language arts (ELA). The BERC Group worked directly with each identified publisher's representative(s) to facilitate completion of initial screening criteria and rubrics, which included their self-assessment. The publishers were required to follow a three-step process to be considered for review:

1. Submit a "Letter of Intent"
2. Complete a "non-negotiable" self-assessment
3. Complete a CCSS alignment self-assessment

Tables 1 & 2 provide a list of publishers and programs that met the requirements of the initial screening process. These programs were then reviewed by the BERC research team to determine which materials would advance to the Hawaii Curriculum Review Committee (HCRC). The goal of the BERC pre-screening of materials was to narrow the pool of programs to a manageable size, so they could be reviewed by the HCRC within the resource constraints (time/budget) set by the HIDOE. Each publisher's representative was contacted to submit review copies of all the materials directly to The BERC Group.

After The BERC Group conducted a full evaluation of materials, programs were rank ordered and recommended for review by the HCRC. The first round of HCRC evaluations were conducted in January/February, 2013. The second round of HCRC evaluations was conducted in April, 2013.

**Table 1. Math Curriculum Materials Publishers and Programs**

<b>Grade-band</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>Grades</b>
Elementary	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Go Math!</i>	K-6
	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Math Expressions</i>	K-5
	McGraw Hill – <i>My Math</i>	K-5
	Pearson – <i>Envision Math</i>	K-6
	Pearson – <i>Investigations</i>	K-5
K-8	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Math in Focus: Singapore Math Common Core</i>	K-8
Secondary	Carnegie Learning – <i>Carnegie Math</i>	6-8
	Cord – <i>Bridges to Algebra</i>	6-8
	Glencoe – <i>Accelerated Math</i>	6-8
	Glencoe/McGraw Hill – <i>Glencoe</i>	6-8, Algebra, Geometry, Algebra 2
	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Big Ideas</i>	6-8
	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Holt McDougal Common Core</i>	6-8, Algebra, Geometry, Algebra 2
	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Larson</i>	Pre-Algebra, Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2, Pre-Calculus
	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Math in Focus: Singapore Math Common Core</i>	6-8
	Pearson – <i>Connected Mathematics (CMP3)</i>	6-8, Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2, Pre-Calculus
	Pearson – <i>Digits</i>	6-8
	Pearson – <i>CME Project Common Core</i>	Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2, Pre-Calculus
	Pearson – <i>Common Core Addition</i>	Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2
	Pearson – <i>Prentice Hall Common Core</i>	6-8
	Perfection Learning – <i>Kinetic Math</i>	6-8

**Table 2. ELA Curriculum Materials Publishers and Programs**

<b>Grade-band</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>Grades</b>
Elementary	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Journeys</i>	K-6
	McGraw Hill – <i>Wonders</i>	K-6
	National Geographic (Cengage Learning) – <i>Reach for Reading</i>	K-5
	Scott Foresman – <i>Reading Street</i>	K-6
	Scholastic Community – <i>Traits Writing and Reading Curriculum</i>	K-6
Secondary	Bedford, Freeman, and Worth – <i>Models for Writers</i>	9-12
	Bedford, Freeman, and Worth – <i>Patterns for College Writers</i>	9-12
	Bedford, Freeman, and Worth – <i>Reflections</i>	9-12
	Bedford, Freeman, and Worth – <i>Common Threads</i>	9-12
	CICERO Systems – <i>History Beyond the Textbook</i>	6-12
	College Board – <i>SpringBoard</i>	6-12
	Scholastic – <i>Expert 21</i>	6-8
	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Holt-McDougall Literature: Common Core</i>	6-12
	Pearson – <i>Common Core Literature</i>	6-12
	Pearson – <i>Prentice Hall Writing Coach</i>	6-12
Pearson – <i>Prentice Hall Literature</i>	6-12	

## **Pre-Screening Evaluation Process**

The BERC research team evaluated each textbook/program (all grade levels) regarding content and pedagogical alignment to CCSS, student learning activities, formative and summative assessments, supplemental resources, and availability of digital materials. Researchers used the publisher's self-assessment as a reference during the review process, but the publishers' self-assessment results were not a factor in the final evaluation of the textbook.

Researchers used the *Instructional Materials Analysis and Selection: Assessing Content Alignment to the Common Core State Standards* tool developed at the Charles A. Dana Center at the University of Texas. The purpose of the instrument is to help schools and districts select instructional materials aligned with Common Core State Standards.

### **Studying the standards.**

Researchers confirmed a current and functional knowledge of the standards. They participated in a guided exploration of the standards, and developed a working knowledge of the standards' structures. The focus of these Phase 1 activities was to develop a common understanding of the standards, and the essential ideas relayed in the CCSS for horizontal and vertical alignment. The first phase of screening included the extent to which the materials met the "non-negotiables" set by the HIDOE.

### **Narrowing the field of instructional materials.**

Researchers continued to narrow the field of curriculum materials submitted by publishers to a manageable size by using the tools developed by the Dana Center, The Common Core Standards Writers and the Hawaii Curriculum Research and Development Group. Researchers separated curriculum materials by publishers into three grade-bands: K-5, 6-8, and high school. They used the publisher's self-assessment to review the pages identified by the publishers as to where standards were covered in the materials. This review focused on the extent to which instructional standards/practices and content standards were embedded in the materials. Researchers calibrated scoring in small teams to make a final determination regarding alignment (pedagogical and content).

### **Assessment of vertical alignment of instructional materials.**

After completing an extensive grade-level analysis, each team then expanded the review to determine the degree to which each set of textbook/programs addressed the CCSS, instructional practices, and depth of content across the grade levels above and below the one they had completed originally.

### **Recommendation of materials to the Hawaii Curriculum Review Committee.**

The BERC Group presented findings to HIDOE representatives to confirm capacity to review the number of programs being referred to the HCRC. Through two separate rounds of pre-screening, The BERC Group referred the top four elementary school math programs (K-5); top six middle school math programs (6-8); and top two high school math programs (Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry) to the HIDOE for consideration. They were:

Elementary School (Grades K-5)

- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Go Math!*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Math Expressions*
- McGraw Hill – *My Math*
- Pearson – *Envision Math*

Middle School (Grades 6-8)

- Carnegie Learning – *Carnegie Math*
- Glencoe/McGraw Hill – *Glencoe*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Holt McDougal Common Core*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Math in Focus: Singapore Math Common Core*
- Pearson – *Connected Mathematics (CMP 3)*
- Pearson – *Digits*

High School (Grades 9-12)

- Glencoe /McGraw Hill – *Glencoe*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Holt McDougal Common Core*

Likewise for ELA, through two separate rounds of pre-screening, The BERC Group referred the top three elementary school programs (K-6) and top four secondary programs (6-12) to the HIDOE for consideration. They were:

Elementary School (Grades K-6)

- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Journeys*
- McGraw Hill – *Wonders*
- Scott Foresman – *Reading Street*

Secondary School (Grades 6-12)

- CICERO Systems – *History Beyond the Textbook*
- College Board – *SpringBoard*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Holt McDougal Literature: Common Core*
- Pearson – *Common Core Literature*

After a dialogue between BERC and HIDOE officials, a collaborative decision was made to present all of the programs listed above to the HCRC for final evaluation.

## **HIDOE Content Specialist Evaluation Process**

### **Math**

The BERC Group conducted two rounds of onsite facilitation of the Math HCRC. The first round was the last week of January, 2013. The second round was April 24-25, 2013. The BERC Group facilitators worked with the HIDOE mathematics HCRC to review, score, and rank the 12 math programs that surfaced through the BERC pre-screening process. The HIDOE Mathematics HCRC was comprised of 48 K-12, mathematics teachers, coaches, principals, and other math experts. The goal was to rank the programs for recommendation to the HIDOE for adoption.

The HCRC Evaluation Process focused on the extent to which materials aligned with:

1. 8 Standards for Mathematical Practice (Instructional Standards)
2. Common Core State Standards (Content Standards)
3. Overall Usability and Impression of the Program (Overall Impression)
4. Digital Materials Requirement and Support (Textbook Overview)

### **English Language Arts**

The BERC Group conducted two rounds of onsite facilitation of the ELA HCRC. The first round was the first week of February, 2013. The second round was April 22-24, 2013. The BERC Group facilitators worked with the HIDOE ELA HCRC to review, score, and rank the seven ELA programs that surfaced through the BERC pre-screening process. The HIDOE ELA HCRC was comprised of 30 K-12, ELA teachers, coaches, principals, and other ELA experts. The goal was to rank the (K-12) programs for recommendation to the HIDOE for adoption.

The HCRC Evaluation Process focused on the extent to which materials aligned with:

1. Common Core State Standards (Content Standards)
2. Overall Usability and Impression of the Program (Overall Impression)
3. Digital Materials Requirement, Pedagogical Shifts, and Support (Textbook Overview)

### **Summary of HCRC Procedures**

The HCRC meetings opened with The BERC Group providing an overview of the process to date, including how The BERC Group narrowed down the field of textbook/programs. As the agenda was presented, the participants were organized into grade-level teams of three to four reviewers each.

The HCRC members familiarized themselves with the textbooks/programs by participating in a Pre-Gallery Walk of the materials within their respective grade-bands, (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12). During the Pre-Gallery Walk, reviewers filled out the Textbook Overview form. As part of this process, the HCRC reviewed the programs' digital materials. In addition, they looked for a clear crosswalk with CCSS, clear labeling of the CCSS with lessons, standards for mathematical practice clearly labeled within lessons (math only), pedagogical suggestions, and response to intervention (RTI) suggestions. Each area was scored on a 4-point scale. A mean score of 3.0 or higher was considered a positive response. The Gallery Walk also provided the teams an opportunity to evaluate the ease of use and overall (initial) impressions of the program. These two areas were

evaluated on a 10-point scale with a mean score of 8.0 or higher being a positive response. The purpose of the Pre-Gallery Walk was for grade-level teams to familiarize themselves with the materials and capture their first impressions. These scores were only used as a comparison to the Post-Gallery Walk scores to measure change over time (if appropriate).

Next, the reviewers looked for alignment between the program materials and CCSS. The mathematics reviewers ranked the CCSS against important mathematical ideas, skills and procedures, and mathematical relationships, and also gave each standard an overall score. The ELA participants ranked the standards against three key ideas: concept/skills development, integration, rigor/depth, and gave each standard an overall score. Additionally, the mathematics screening included scoring the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices for all curricular materials, by grade level.

Due to time constraints during the first round of the Math HCRC evaluation, reviewers were not able to evaluate the textbook/programs against all of the CCSS (Content Standards) or for all grade levels. Therefore, math content standards were evaluated at one grade-level within each grade-band: 1<sup>st</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grades. During the second round of the Math HCRC evaluation process, reviewers were able to evaluate the textbook/programs against all of the CCSS (Content Standards) for all grade levels. During the ELA HCRC evaluation process, reviewers were able to evaluate the textbook/programs against all of the CCSS (Content Standards) for all grade levels.

The reviewers used the same publisher's self-assessment The BERC Group researchers used to identify pages where standards were located in the materials. Each grade-level team reviewed their materials and recorded their scores. The HCRC members then met in grade-band groups to discuss scoring. Finally, they met in a two large groups (K-5 and 6-12) to explain their scores for each set of curriculum materials.

The final step for the reviewers was to complete a Post-Gallery Walk to reassess the Textbook Overview forms they completed on the first day, to once again evaluate the materials using the same criteria. They looked at the programs' digital materials, looked for a clear crosswalk with CCSS, clear alignment to the CCSS within the lessons, standards for mathematical practice clearly labeled and addressed within lessons (math only), pedagogical suggestions, and response to intervention (RTI). The Post-Gallery Walk Textbook Overview scores were included within the Overall Evaluation Score (OES).

To mitigate the possibility of "group think" developing and/or rater pre-knowledge bias influencing overall outcomes of the evaluation, the analyses averaged all group (grade-level and standards) responses into a single OES for each program, so scoring extremes would be mitigated. ELA analysis generated three criteria scores that were averaged together into the OES. Math analysis generated four criteria scores that were averaged together into the OES. Math had four criteria because of the explicit pedagogical standards contained in the CCSS (8 Standards for Mathematical Practice). The ELA Pedagogical Shifts were addressed along with the analysis of digital and other support materials. Tables 3 and 4 provide data for each of the criteria and the Overall Evaluation Score.

**Table 3. Math HCRC Evaluation Scoring Summary**

Publisher & Curriculum/Program	Instructional Standards	Content Standards	Textbook Overview	Overall Impression	Math OES
<b>Elementary School (Grades K-5)</b>					
Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Go Math!</i>	2.10	2.48	2.90	2.03	<b>2.38</b>
Pearson – <i>Envision Math</i>	2.10	2.20	2.90	2.25	<b>2.36</b>
McGraw Hill – <i>My Math</i>	1.94	2.27	2.90	2.25	<b>2.34</b>
Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Math Expressions</i>	1.90	1.62	2.10	1.58	<b>1.80</b>
<b>Middle School (Grades 6-8)</b>					
Carnegie Learning – <i>Carnegie Math</i>	2.98	3.19	2.88	3.5	<b>3.14</b>
Glencoe/McGraw Hill – <i>Glencoe Grades</i>	2.50	2.70	3.20	3.50	<b>2.98</b>
Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Math in Focus: Singapore Math Common Core</i>	2.58	3.01	2.79	3.0	<b>2.85</b>
Pearson – <i>Connected Mathematics (CMP3)</i>	3.17	2.63	2.44	2.42	<b>2.66</b>
Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Holt McDougal Common Core</i>	1.78	2.20	2.70	1.67	<b>2.09</b>
Pearson – <i>Digits</i>	2.20	2.10	2.70	1.17	<b>2.04</b>
<b>High School (Grades 9-12)</b>					
Glencoe/McGraw Hill – <i>Glencoe Algebra 1, Algebra 2, Geometry</i>	2.30	2.00	2.31	1.67	<b>2.07</b>
Houghton Mifflin Harcourt- <i>Holt McDougal Common Core</i>	2.00	1.90	2.22	1.50	<b>1.91</b>

Note. Values above are based on a 4.0 scale.

**Table 4. ELA HCRC Evaluation Scoring Summary**

Publisher & Curriculum/Program	Content Standards	Textbook Overview	Overall Impression	ELA OES
<b>Elementary (Grades K-6)</b>				
McGraw Hill – <i>Wonders</i>	3.01	3.30	3.64	<b>3.32</b>
Houghton, Mifflin, & Harcourt – <i>Journeys</i>	2.67	3.31	3.00	<b>2.99</b>
Scott Foresman – <i>Reading Street</i>	1.86	2.53	1.86	<b>2.08</b>
<b>Secondary (Grades 6-12)</b>				
College Board – <i>SpringBoard</i>	3.39	2.84	3.14	<b>3.12</b>
Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – <i>Holt McDougal Common Core Literature</i>	2.79	2.94	2.57	<b>2.77</b>
Pearson – <i>Literature Common Core</i>	3.08	2.69	2.43	<b>2.73</b>
CICERO Systems – <i>History Beyond the Textbook</i>	1.30	1.66	1.57	<b>1.51</b>

Note. Values above are based on a 4.0 scale.

## Hawaii Curriculum Review Committee Findings

### Math

Below is a summary of results for the mathematics textbook/program evaluation conducted by the HCRC. The reviewers used a 4-point scale to determine how each publisher addressed the following three criteria: alignment to the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices (Instructional Standards); alignment to the CCSS (Content Standards); and Gallery Walk (Textbook Overview). Reviewers also used a 10-point scale to measure *ease of use* and *overall impressions* (Overall Impressions). The 10-point scales were converted to 4-point scales: 1,2,3=1; 4,5=2; 6,7=3; 8,9,10=4. These four measures (Instructional Standards, Content Standards, Textbook Overview, Overall Impressions) were averaged together to determine the Math Overall Evaluation Score (OES).

After analysis and triangulation of the data, no textbook/program evaluated during round one scored above a mean of 3.0. The top two elementary (K-5) textbook/programs were Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's *Go Math!* (2.38) and Pearson's *Envision Math* (2.36). The top two middle school (grades 6-8) math programs in round one were McGraw Hill's *Glencoe* (2.98) and Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's *Holt McDougal Common Core* (2.09). The top two high school programs were McGraw Hill's *Glencoe* (2.07) and Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's *Holt McDougal Common Core* (1.91). Because none of the programs reached the 3.0 threshold for further review, The BERC Group recommended another round of evaluation. In the second round of evaluations, only one program – Carnegie Learning's *Carnegie Math*– scored above a 3.0, with a mean score of 3.14. We would consider recommendation of any textbook/program scoring a 3.0 or higher. Therefore, *Carnegie Math* emerged as the textbook/program that we would be recommended for further consideration.

### ELEMENTARY MATH

**Go Math!** Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's *Go Math!* curriculum materials had the highest elementary Math Overall Evaluation Score of 2.38 on the 4-point scale, a score of 2.10 on the Instructional Standards, 2.48 on the Content Standards, 2.90 on the Textbook Overview, and 2.03 for Overall Impression.

#### ***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers identified the publisher's use of diagrams and pictures as strengths, along with the multiple tools that students had at their disposal.
- However, reviewers also identified limited support for student discussion on different ways to solve problems. One review team noted, "Both the student and teacher editions have structures present, but lack multiple approaches."

#### ***Content Standards.***

- A strength identified by reviewers was the real-world connection. One review team noted, "The student edition has multiple real-world geometric problems for students to solve and use various tools."
- Another review team noted, "We only saw one lesson that discussed and leant itself to comparing." Another team remarked, "There is moderate modeling of process, but it's not sufficient."

### ***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers noted online materials as being available and transparent. However, they found some areas of the online resources confusing. Reviewers also remarked the online component was more teacher-centered rather than student-centered.
- Reviews revealed the crosswalk clearly was labeled by lesson and by chapter or domain; however, most noted the standards within the crosswalk were not well-developed.
- Reviewers' responses to the pedagogical suggestions were mixed. One team noted, "While this program had better discussion prompts and real-world connections, it is not evident in all lessons, and concepts are not developed concretely in each lesson."

**Envision Math.** Pearson's *Envision Math* curriculum materials had a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 2.36 on the 4-point scale, a score of 2.10 on the Instructional Standards, 2.20 on the Content Standards, 2.90 on the Textbook Overview, and 2.25 for Overall Impression.

### ***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers noted students were not asked to explain thinking and had very few open-ended questions.
- One review team expressed concern with "lack of opportunity for students to de-contextualize and then contextualize information, and the need for more hands-on exploration." Another review team noted being unable to find evidence associated with Mathematical Practice number seven.
- All grade level teams also shared concerns that the *Envisions* program is "too teacher-directed."

### ***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers noted the text develops the concepts well, such as the "steps for the learning of the associative property." However, the reviewers also noted inconsistency among lessons and the depth of those concepts.
- Reviewers also found a prevalence of "skill and drill" problems. Teams recommended more specific real-world application problems be used in each lesson.

### ***Textbook Overview.***

- The review of the digital materials indicated the online resources were student-friendly. They also noted several concerns with the online/digital resources available with the *Envisions* program.
- Reviewers noted the program clearly labeled the 8 Mathematical Practices within every text, including online and student editions. Reviewers suggested, "While the Mathematical Practices are clearly labeled, they are not developed to their full extent."
- Teams also reviewed the use of RTI suggestions and identified them as present and appropriate, but "time consuming" and "difficult to use."

**My Math.** McGraw Hill's *My Math* curriculum materials had a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 2.34 on the 4-point scale, a score of 1.94 on the Instructional Standards, 2.27 on the Content Standards, 2.90 on the Textbook Overview, and 2.25 for Overall Impression.

### ***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers expressed a desire for more problems explicitly giving the students opportunities to compare multiple approaches, choose tools, and compare/critique arguments.
- Reviewers also expressed a preference for more visual descriptions and opportunities for students to choose the appropriate tool for a specific situation rather than the textbook “telling them which tool to use.”
- Reviewers found limited real-world application problems provided. One review team wanted to see a stronger focus on conceptual understanding, as opposed to getting the right answer.
- Reviewers also noted a lack of pedagogical suggestions to support student discussion and reflection.

### ***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers shared, “The lessons had some good open-ended questions and depth of student practice of concepts, but needed more depth on questioning and needed more verbal opportunities.”
- Reviewers noted missed opportunities to increase rigor through student text investigation and more manipulative time to understand concept and properties.”

### ***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers shared the *My Math* digital materials provided games which were engaging for the appropriate grade level of the student. However, they expressed concerns the games did not always meet or address the standards.
- Reviewers also noted, “We can alter and create assignments digitally, and there is a good mix of digital materials available.”
- Reviewers noted concerns with the correlation to standards in the crosswalks as well as the depth of the lessons. Reviewers also identified “the lack of the CCSS being listed or labeled within the lesson, so teachers don't know what part of lesson covers which standard.”
- Reviewers noted the pedagogical suggestions were limited in concept development especially with concrete materials, and primarily relied on worksheets.

**Math Expressions.** Houghton Mifflin Harcourt’s *Math Expressions* curriculum materials had a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 1.80 on the 4-point scale, a score of 1.90 on the Instructional Standards, 1.62 on the Content Standards, 2.10 on the Textbook Overview, and 1.58 for Overall Impression.

### ***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers identified strengths of the materials, such as the ability to have students check answers using different methods and examples of other ways to solve problems. One review team stated, “The fifth-grade text provides prompts as to what students should look for and recognize in structure and pattern.”
- Reviewers expressed a desire for more rigor across the grades reviewed, and noted limited real-world contextual connections.

- Reviewers suggested student editions could incorporate more “problems to solve on their own without example solutions in the book, as well as have students create their own models.”

***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers noted alignment to the CCSS and a strong presence of pictures and drawings within the text, but suggested the opportunity for students to develop their own was limited.
- One team noted, “The skills in the lessons are not connected to the concept taught, and occur in isolation from the situation.”
- Reviewers also found limited support for some concepts, such as the least common multiple, and noted areas where “deeper connections” could be made.

***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers were unable to find an online edition, and had difficulty downloading the online resources that were available. As a review team stated, “The digital resources are not accessible by iPad, and there are no QuickTime videos.”
- In their review of the crosswalk, reviewers found it was accurately and effectively diagrammed within each unit; however, they noted it could be more strongly linked to CCSS.

## MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH

**Carnegie Math.** Carnegie Learning’s *Carnegie Math* curriculum materials scored the highest of the three middle school math programs. With a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 3.14 on the 4-point scale, a score of 2.98 on the Instructional Standards, 3.19 on the Content Standards, 2.88 on the Textbook Overview, and 3.5 for Overall Impression, *Carnegie Math* emerged as the only textbook/program that would be recommended for further consideration.

***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers noted “Carnegie seems to have a collaborative approach” and “many opportunities for students to discuss and share their thinking.”
- Reviewers also found this program had “good vocabulary and complex problems.”
- Reviewers noted the program “provides multiple methods and ask students to reflect upon the most efficient one (graph vs. equation). However, it does *not* allow students to determine the most appropriate tool for a given task; instead it gives them the tools.”

***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers said the *Carnegie Math* had “great scaffolding” to help students develop concepts and skills.
- Reviewers also found the animations in the online software helpful.
- Reviewers noted many problems focused on skill development, and that real-world examples and opportunities for students to apply their learning were clear.

***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers described the online software, Mathia, as “difficult to access.”
- Reviewers noted CCSS labels were found within the teacher editions of the textbooks, but were “not necessarily obvious” for teachers to reference. Reviewers also could not find CCSS labels in the students’ editions.

**Glencoe.** Glencoe/McGraw Hill’s *Glencoe 6-8* curriculum materials had a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 2.98 on the 4-point scale, a score of 2.50 on the Instructional Standards, 2.70 on the Content Standards, 3.20 on the Textbook Overview, and 3.50 for Overall Impression.

***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers liked that practices were embedded in the Higher Order Thinking (HOT) Problems.
- Concerns noted by reviewers were similar to those found by their elementary counterparts. Reviewers specifically noted, “Rigor is not consistent throughout, and student editions do not ask for justification of why students solve the problem the way they did.”

***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers noted areas of strength in relation to CCSS alignment, such as connections to algebra and geometry in the middle grades.
- Areas for improvement noted by reviewers included limited real-world and application problems, and “missing explanation” for mean absolute deviation.
- Reviewers also suggested a need for “more explanation of and practice for multi-step and negative rational number examples.”

***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers noted in their review of the digital materials that student’s online access was easy to navigate and good real-world videos were available. Other positive remarks included the suggestions for lesson plans and the availability of online resources to create tests, differentiate assignments, manage and assign homework, and edit worksheets.
- Reviewers observed “CCSS icons” throughout the text, labeling the publisher’s use of the crosswalk, and clearly labeling the CCSS the mathematical practice within each lesson.
- The review of the publishers pedagogical and RTI suggestions revealed strengths, such as the amount of re-teach and enrichment worksheets online and in the text, formative assessment cues, unit projects, and the inquiry labs.

**Math in Focus: Singapore Math Common Core.** Houghton Mifflin Harcourt’s *Math in Focus: Singapore Math Common Core* curriculum materials had a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 2.85 on the 4-point scale, a score of 2.58 on the Instructional Standards, 3.01 on the Content Standards, 2.79 on the Textbook Overview, and 3.0 for Overall Impression.

### ***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers found *Singapore Math*'s instructional support lacking. One team commented, “Rich problems exist, but there is no guidance for teachers on the instructional pedagogy.”
- Reviewers commented, “Teachers are explaining concepts that students should be having discussions over.”
- Reviewers also expressed a desire for more “meaningful opportunities to discuss and critique work of others.”

### ***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers found “lots of teacher-led learning” with “few opportunities for students to discover patterns.”
- Reviewers noted there were limited “real-world contexts.”
- Reviewers found limited opportunities for students to use tools other than the integer chips.
- Reviewers also noted opportunities for more depth in the math journals.

### ***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers noted there was a crosswalk to the CCSS in the front of the teacher’s edition, but that CCSS were not labeled within the lessons or in the student edition.
- Reviewers found there was “not necessarily a separate [digital] curriculum in and of itself, just an online version [of the textbook] with a little bit more.” However, they noted they “liked the parent resources.”
- Reviewers found limited pedagogical support. One team noted that “teachers could easily teach traditionally and not engage [in] rigorous mathematics.”

**Connected Mathematics (CMP3).** Pearson’s *Connected Mathematics (CMP3)* curriculum materials had a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 2.66 on the 4-point scale, a score of 3.17 on the Instructional Standards, 2.63 on the Content Standards, 2.44 on the Textbook Overview, and 2.42 for Overall Impression.

### ***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers noted use of tools such as angle rulers, graph paper, protractors, and technology.
- Reviewers found the program included “opportunities to communicate ideas” and vocabulary highlighted at the beginning of each chapter.
- Reviewers noted, “ACE questions are challenging, extension problems provide opportunities for perseverance and the problem sets have many open-ended questions that do not have single-solution answers.”
- Reviewers also noted, “Pearson provides opportunities for students to observe patterns and come to conclusions based on those patterns.”

### ***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers found the teacher’s edition included prompts for students to explain their thinking.
- Reviewers also found “lots of opportunities for students to work with concepts.”

- Reviewers noted the program “does a good job with most algebraic methods of solving systems.”
- Reviewers also noted opportunities to more fully develop “the idea of how or why a rational number terminates or eventually repeats.”

***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers noted the “interactivity of CMP3 was a plus.”
- Reviewers found the CCSS and 8 Mathematical Practices were not labeled within CMP2, although they were at the beginning of CMP3.
- Reviewers noted the score was “affected by limited exposure to curriculum.”

**Holt McDougall Common Core.** Houghton Mifflin Harcourt’s *Holt McDougall Common Core* grades 6-8 curriculum materials had a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 2.09 on the 4-point scale, a score of 1.78 on the Instructional Standards, 2.20 on the Content Standards, 2.70 on the Textbook Overview, and 1.67 for Overall Impression.

***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers noted lack of opportunities for students to check work using different methods and that mathematical practices were taught in isolation.
- Reviewers found rigor could be increased through student interaction, discussion, and critique, and through giving students opportunities to choose which tools to use. As one team noted, “Neither the teacher nor student edition addressed a need for debrief and/or reflection.”

***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers noted the text provided good, clear examples of problems for students to reference, and it connected ideas and concepts to other domains.
- Reviewers stated found limited real-world situations and opportunities for students to justify their answers, and noted many skills were taught in isolation.
- One review team noted “Students need more opportunity to develop and experiment with ideas of their own.”

***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers noted the ease of use of online resources. Some preferred working with the online text, and liked that the worksheets were downloadable. One team stated, “The online resources were easy for all to use and it provided a video explanation right on the e-book page.”
- In review of the labeling of the content crosswalk and the 8 Mathematical Practices, reviewers found it necessary to use the text and workbook. As one review team noted, “Having to use the textbook and workbook to determine crosswalk and treatment of the 8 Mathematical Practices was clumsy.”

**Digits.** Pearson’s *Digits* 6-8 curriculum materials had a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 2.04 on the 4-point scale, a score of 2.20 on the Instructional Standards, 2.10 on the Content Standards, 2.70 on the Gallery Walk, and 1.17 for Overall Impression.

### ***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers noted the 8 Mathematical Practices as hard to find and, in many cases, not identified within the program. One teacher suggested, “The *Digits* program needs a hard copy of all resources.”
- Reviewers also noted that explanations had only one possible solution, instead of multiple methods or suggestions to solve problems.
- Reviewers also identified the ability of the program to explore arguments, but noted a lack of opportunities for students to critique others’ arguments.

### ***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers had difficulty in finding evidence of program alignment to CCSS.
- Also reviewers noted some questions lacked higher-level thinking process and real-world application with connections to other domains.

### ***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers indicated the *Digits* program, which is completely online, requires a lot of perseverance and training in how to use it.
- Reviewers also noted however the “launch clips were great, but the other resources online were not rigorous, nor did they attend to precision.”
- One review team stated, “One of the difficulties is you have to keep opening up units to see which lessons are in them and where you were at. This is very hard to navigate for teachers and students.”

## **HIGH SCHOOL MATH**

**Glencoe.** Glencoe/McGraw Hill’s *Glencoe* Algebra 1, Geometry, and Algebra 2 curriculum materials had a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 2.07 on the 4-point scale, a score of 2.30 on the Instructional Standards, 2.00 on the Content Standards, 2.31 on the Textbook Overview, and 1.67 for Overall Impression.

### ***Instructional Standards.***

- Reviewers of the algebra materials identified the text integrated the 8 Mathematical Practices throughout the lesson and provided multiple opportunities for students to exercise these practices throughout the lesson. In particular, *Algebra* reviewers stated, “For reasoning abstractly, students were asked to specifically explain, describe, and analyze.”
- *Algebra* reviewers suggested more opportunities for students to choose their own tool rather than it being isolated in extended lessons or labs.
- Geometry and Algebra 2 reviewers noted there could be more connection to the 8 Mathematical Practices. While reasoning was embedded in lessons, reviewers noted it did not always treat the mathematical practices accurately.

### ***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers of the geometry text noted the student edition required a considerable amount of writing as a means of communicating the answer. However reviewers had difficulty in identifying the unifying concepts/themes and their alignment to the CCSS.

- As one reviewer noted, “The student text does not always ask to give arguments and there is not enough student prediction. It is very skill-based.”

**Textbook Overview.**

- Reviewers identified the test generator was very comprehensive and provided for different styles of assessment.
- Of particular concern to reviewers, however, was that e-books are not available on iPads, as Adobe Flash is required to access the e-books. One review team noted, “Overall their online materials are not very user-friendly, as it is hard to find things.”
- Another team noted pedagogy was “hinted” at, but could be made more explicit and better embedded in lesson development.

**Holt McDougal Common Core.** Houghton Mifflin Harcourt’s *Holt McDougal Common Core* Algebra 1, Geometry, and Algebra 2 curriculum materials had a Math Overall Evaluation Score of 1.91 on the 4-point scale, a score of 2.00 on the Instructional Standards, 1.90 on the Content Standards, 2.22 on the Textbook Overview, and 1.50 for Overall Impression.

**Instructional Standards.**

- Review teams noted the treatment of the 8 Mathematical Practices was not consistently integrated throughout lesson and sometimes showed up at the end.
- Review teams identified a lack of opportunities for students to justify arguments and analyze errors

**Content Standards.**

- Review teams indicated students needed more opportunity to justify their answers and many skills were taught in isolation. They also found a lack of real-world situations.
- The review teams noted, “The textbook by itself does not have strong alignment to the CCSS; however, when used in accordance with the workbook, this improves greatly.”

**Textbook Overview.**

- Review teams found pedagogical and RTI suggestions in supplemental materials, but not in the textbook. They also noted lesson plans could be more “highly developed.”

## English Language Arts

Below is a summary of results for the ELA textbook/program evaluation conducted by the HCRC. The reviewers used a 4-point scale to determine how each publisher addressed the following two criteria: alignment to the CCSS (Content Standards) and Gallery Walk (Textbook Overview). Reviewers also used a 10-point scale to measure *ease of use* and *overall impressions* (Overall Impression.). The 10-point scales were converted to 4-point scales: 1,2,3=1; 4,5=2; 6,7=3; 8,9,10=4. These three measures were averaged together to determine the Total ELA Overall Evaluation Score.

After analysis and triangulation of the data, one elementary and one secondary textbook/program scored above a mean of 3.0. The top two elementary (K-6) textbook/programs were McGraw Hill’s *Wonders* (3.32) and Houghton Mifflin/ Harcourt’s, *Journeys* (2.99). The top two secondary school (grades 7-12) ELA programs were College Board’s *SpringBoard* (3.12) and Houghton Mifflin Harcourt’s *Holt McDougal Literature Common Core* (2.77). We would consider recommendation of any textbook/program scoring a 3.0 or higher. The *Wonders* (K-6) and *SpringBoard* (6-12) both

reached the 3.0 threshold. *Journeys* was very close to the 3.0 threshold. However, because it did not score 3.00 on the OES and because of the gap between the *Wonders* and *Journeys* scores (3.32 and 2.99 respectively on the OES; and 3.01 and 2.67 respectively on the alignment to CCSS – Content Standards), only *Wonders* was recommended for further consideration.

## ELEMENTARY ELA

**Wonders.** McGraw Hill’s *Wonders* curriculum materials scored the highest of the three elementary ELA textbook/programs. With an ELA Overall Evaluation Score of 3.32 on the 4-point scale, a score of 3.01 on the Content Standards, 3.30 on the Textbook Overview, and 3.64 for Overall Impression, *Wonders* emerged as the only elementary textbook/program that would be recommended for further consideration.

### *Content Standards.*

- Reviewers found the texts to be sufficiently complex and a variety of fiction and nonfiction texts. There was a concern the texts being used were only loosely connected and the students would have a hard time comparing the texts.

### *Textbook Overview.*

- Reviewers noted finding the CCSS labeled “in the teacher’s edition, but not in the student edition.”
- Reviewers found evidence of differentiated levels of ELL vocabulary and detailed small-group instruction, but noted each section was not clear. They also noted a lack of RTI for students with disabilities.
- The digital materials were noted by the reviewers as being “engaging, easy to navigate, fully available on-line (even on mobile devices), and could be fully a digital program.”

**Journeys.** Houghton Mifflin Harcourt’s, *Journeys* curriculum materials had an ELA Overall Evaluation Score of 2.99 on the 4-point scale, a score of 2.67 on the Content Standards, 3.31 on the Textbook Overview, and 3.00 for Overall Impressions.

### *Content Standards.*

- Reviewers found *Journeys* had a wide variety of text selection, but within the units the texts were not related to each other.
- Reviewers found because the texts in the units have very little to do with each other, the ability for the students to compare the text was not aligned to CCSS.
- Reviewers noted the majority of instructional time was not spent on text-dependent questions. The reviewers found many of the questions were not related to the specific text, but could be asked of any text.

### ***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers found the CCSS standards labeled in “both the teacher and student editions.”
- When researching the pedagogical suggestions, the reviewers were conflicted on what they found. One set of reviewers found the textbook/program had “lessons clearly explained and detailed”, while another noted the lessons “did not scaffold, were unclear, didn’t flow, and were very much in isolation.”
- Digital materials were noted by the reviewers as having clickable correlations to standards, teacher planner, e-student books, read aloud capability, highlighting and note taking options, and consumable materials. Reviewers were not in consensus whether or not the digital materials were user friendly.

**Reading Street.** Scott Foresman’s *Reading Street* curriculum materials had an ELA Overall Evaluation Score of 2.08 on the 4-point scale, a score of 1.86 on the Content Standards, 2.53 on the Textbook Overview, and 1.86 for Overall Impressions.

### ***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers found *Reading Street* to be “heavy and clunky.”
- Reviewers found a wide variety of activities and assignments provided, but limited support for the teachers to identify what is most important for preparing students to meet CCSS expectations.
- Reviewers found following the program in the current order and time frame would not create an environment conducive for implementing the CCSS. Reviewers felt the program needs editing and paring down.
- The reviewers also found the lessons were reliant on the teachers to provide connections to the students, instead of the students gaining information through their own reading.

### ***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers found CCSS in both the teacher and student’s editions.
- The reviewers were overwhelmed with all the material the textbook/program provided. They did find scaffolding, but were unclear how to use the group work to further enhance the lessons.
- The digital materials were noted as “easy to use, but certain components were not easy to access due to having to click through multiple folders.” Also noted was the teacher and student editions’ ability to be used on mobile devices.

## **SECONDARY – ELA**

**SpringBoard.** College Board’s *SpringBoard* curriculum materials scored the highest of the four secondary ELA textbook/programs. With an ELA Overall Evaluation Score of 3.12 on the 4-point scale, a score of 3.39 on the Content Standards, 2.84 on the Textbook Overview, and 3.14 for Overall Impression, *SpringBoard* emerged as the only secondary textbook/program that would be recommended for further consideration.

**Content Standards.**

- Reviewers noted *SpringBoard's* “thematic approach provides for deep development and integration. Units build in complexity and depth, challenging students to think critically.”
- Reviewers found a “strong use of graphic organizers and close-reading activities.”
- Reviewers also found research skills were consistently developed through regular “mini-research” projects.

**Textbook Overview.**

- Reviewers noted digital copies of the textbooks were available. They expressed hopes that even more interactive digital elements would be forthcoming.
- Reviewers noted *SpringBoard* was “awesome for new teachers” because it “shows teachers best practices.”
- Reviewers also noted the textbook/program’s pre-AP focus led to “lots of high level/complex text with minimal support.”

**Holt McDougal Literature Common Core.** Houghton Mifflin Harcourt’s *Holt McDougal Literature Common Core* curriculum materials had an ELA Overall Evaluation Score of 2.77 on the 4-point scale, a score of 2.79 on the Content Standards, 2.94 on the Textbook Overview, and 2.57 for Overall Impressions.

**Content Standards.**

- Reviewers found *Holt McDougal Literature's* vocabulary and language skills development similar to “traditional practices” and lacking the depth required by CCSS.
- Reviewers noted speaking and listening tasks were “challenging, but not embedded in units.”
- Reviewers found the writing units were “easy to use and developed well,” with “good suggestions for publication – very specific about multimedia and publishing online.”
- Reviewers also noted reading questions, especially those focused on analysis, “don’t ask students to go deep enough.”

**Textbook Overview.**

- Reviewers noted CCSS were labeled within lessons, but they were unsure of the accuracy of those labels.
- Reviewers noted the “Kno system was value added,” and that student work could be stored on the publisher’s servers.
- Reviewers found the pedagogical suggestions “provide[d] opportunities for group work and sharing, but lacking in real-world scenarios.”
- Reviewers noted activities for English language learners and students with disabilities were heavily scaffolded and sometimes lacking in rigor.

**Common Core Literature.** Pearson’s *Common Core Literature* curriculum materials had an ELA Overall Evaluation Score of 2.73 on the 4-point scale, a score of 3.08 on the Content Standards, 2.69 on the Textbook Overview, and 2.43 for Overall Impressions.

***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers noted, “The prototype is organized with exceptional concept/skill development, the text builds on foundation knowledge, and extension activities are strong.”
- Reviewers found language standards had “repeated exposure in multiple tasks” and were “integrated with reading, writing, and speaking.”
- Reviewers noted the rigor of prompting and questions could be increased.
- Reviewers also noted “standards are aligned, but connections are vague.”

***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers noted it was “hard to accurately and fairly rate something incomplete or in draft form.”
- Reviewers also noted materials were still being developed, and that a finished digital prototype was not yet available.
- Reviewers found lessons were “scaffolded, with lots of monitoring opportunities to check for understanding.”
- Reviewers found CCSS labeling “was evident in some units, but missing in others.”
- Reviewers noted “curriculum appears challenging,” but that they didn’t see support for English language learners and students with disabilities.

**History Beyond the Textbook.** CICERO Systems’ *History Beyond the Textbook* curriculum materials had an ELA Overall Evaluation Score of 1.49 on the 4-point scale, a score of 1.30 on the Content Standards, 1.66 on the Textbook Overview, and 1.50 for Overall Impressions.

***Content Standards.***

- Reviewers noted “lessons seem to be social studies based” with limited alignment to ELA standards.
- Reviewers found language development focused on spelling, punctuation, and capitalization, with limited support for “complexities of language development” required in high school. Reviewers also noted the lack of “authentic tasks that require demonstrations of [language] skills.”
- Reviewers noted an emphasis on informational texts and a lack of primary source material.
- Reviewers found reading questions tended to focus on main ideas and supporting details, with minimal focus on analyzing craft or structure.

***Textbook Overview.***

- Reviewers found the digital interface “not intuitive.”
- Reviewers noted digital interface did not facilitate interaction between teachers and students.
- Reviewers noted lessons were not labeled with ELA CCSS. Reviewers thought the rigor of reading passages and writing prompts could be increased.

## Recommendations

### Math

The BERC Group would recommend further consideration of any math textbook/program scoring a 3.0 or higher on the Overall Evaluation Score. After analyses and triangulation of the data from the HIDEO HCRC, one textbook/program, Carnegie Learning's *Carnegie Math* (3.14), met this criterion. Although there is reason to consider *Carnegie Math* for adoption, there are two reasons why we recommend not doing so at this time: (1) due to the legislature's recent decision to fund less than half of HIDEO's request (for Common Core Digital Curriculum initiative), the state is unable to move forward with either a pilot or statewide adoption of a new middle grades mathematics program that is substantially digital-based; and (2) we cannot recommend adopting a 6-8 program without knowing what the K-5 or high school math programs would be.

While it still makes sense to consider the math curriculum evaluation outcomes of the second round of review for grades 6-8, we recommend not moving forward with an adoption at this time. Once the state identifies elementary and high school mathematics textbook/programs that meet the needs of the state, we would recommend re-opening the K-12 math review process to make sure the elementary, middle, and high school math programs all align prior to adoption at any specific grade-band.

### English Language Arts

The BERC Group would recommend further consideration of any ELA textbook/program scoring a 3.0 or higher on the Overall Evaluation Score. After analyses and triangulation of the data from the HIDEO HCRC, one K-6 textbook/program, McGraw Hill's *Wonders* (3.32), met this criterion. In addition, one 6-12 textbook/program College Board's *SpringBoard* (3.12), met this criteria. At this point, we recommend the HIDEO consider *Wonders* and *SpringBoard* as strong candidates for the comprehensive K-12 ELA adoption.



The BERC Group, Inc.  
22232 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE, Suite 305  
Bothell, WA 98021  
Phone: 425-486-3100

Web: [www.bercgroup.com](http://www.bercgroup.com)