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To learn together about:

• The characteristics of high quality materials
• Why materials matter for student success
• The state of the materials market
• Potential next steps for your districts in the selection and/or implementation of high quality materials
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With high-quality instructional materials, the sky’s the limit

EdReports.org Board Member, Audra McPhillips, discusses the importance of passionate educators and high-quality materials in the lives of students across the country.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>9:00-9:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Case for High Quality Materials</td>
<td>9:30-10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Materials Marketplace</td>
<td>10:00-10:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Successful Implementation</td>
<td>10:45-11:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps and Closing</td>
<td>11:30-12:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Take a moment and think about the following questions.

1) What is your district’s approach to instructional materials?
2) What materials are in use in your classrooms?
3) What are teachers doing to implement the standards effectively?

Talk with your team about the successes and challenges you’ve had with this work.
THE CASE FOR HIGH QUALITY MATERIALS
Students learn primarily through interactions with teachers and instructional materials.

“That instructional materials exercise their influence on learning directly as well as by influencing teachers’ instructional choices and behavior, makes instructional materials all the more important.”

-Chingos and Whitehurst 2012
Results of a 144 meta-analyses project that investigated the impact of curriculum on students achievement found an average effect size of +0.45. This is greater than the influence of a student’s home and a student’s school.

“Put into context, this +0.45 effect size translates to an 18 percentile-point difference (i.e., the difference between scoring in the 50th vs. the 68th percentile on an academic assessment) and is roughly equivalent to the average difference in performance between a fourth-and fifth-grade student on a standardized reading test”.

-Hill, Bloom, Rebeck Black, & Lipsey, 2008
WHY MATERIALS MATTER

- Researchers from the Center for Education Policy Research at Harvard estimated that in 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} grade math, switching to a top ranked textbook would translate to student achieve gains of 3.6 percentile points – larger than the improvement of a typical teacher’s effectiveness in their first three years on the job when they are learning to teach. (Kane, Owen, Marinell, Thal, and Staiger, 2016).

- The cost of placing strong curricula in the classroom is not necessarily higher than using weak ones. “Textbooks are relatively inexpensive and tend to be similarly priced. The implication is that the marginal cost of choosing a more effective textbook over a less effective alternative is essentially zero.” (Polikoff and Koedel, 2017)

- The average cost-effectiveness ratio of switching to higher-quality curriculum was almost 40 times that of class-size reduction. (Boser, Chingos and Straus 2015)
A 2015 study found that low-income students are less likely than high-income students to have high quality content and materials in the classroom.

“As it stands now, students’ chances to learn challenging content depend on whether they are lucky enough to attend a school that provides it. In effect, a defense of localism in questions about content amounts to a defense of inequality in opportunity to learn.”  
- Dr. William Schmidt 2013, 2015

“Education is still the great equalizer. If we give our students a quality education, which starts with quality materials, we can change the way children see the world.”

- Dr. Cynthia Nicholson  
Dean, School of Arts and Sciences, Chowan University
Instructional materials have long-term and far-reaching effects on other priorities.

They should...

- inform interim and formative assessment strategies.
- affect how parents engage with their children’s classwork.
- shape how teachers spend their PLC and team time.
- affect the type of professional development that teachers should receive.
LEARNING FROM MATERIALS EFFORTS

1. The decision to adopt new materials is influenced by whether materials are rigorous and aligned to standards more than any other factor

2. Many teachers found students rose to meet the challenge of a high-quality, rigorous instructional materials, even when teachers initially felt the materials would be too difficult for their students

3. Most teachers feel empowered, unburdened, and more creative when they have strong materials

4. Frequent and ongoing professional development is needed to support teachers in understanding, internalizing, and effectively using materials

5. Pacing was the most common challenge identified, particularly within the first few years of implementation

6. Parent involvement plays a role in successful implementation, particularly with mathematics
Only 18% of teachers nationwide strongly agree that their materials are aligned to the standards.
Teachers are heading online to supplement or piece together curriculum.

- 97% Google
- 85% Pinterest
- 79% Teachers Pay Teachers
- 39% EngageNY
Consider the research about the effects of instructional materials on student achievement and instructional vision.

• What do you find confirming or reassuring?
• What was noteworthy or caught your attention and you want to bring with you as you learn more with your team?
THE MATERIALS MARKETPLACE
We found...

- a market flooded with materials that were hastily adapted and repackaged with “CCSS-aligned” stickers.
- new materials that claimed to understand the standards but had very little alignment to the true meaning and intent.
- schools desperate for materials to teach the new standards, experienced enough to know that what they had, or what was out there, wasn’t cutting it.
- teachers, frustrated by the lack of good materials, using any and every avenue to cobble together materials.
EDREPORTS THEORY OF ACTION

Reliable information against quality criteria in a quickly changing marketplace helps educators make informed purchasing decisions and improve student learning.

IDENTIFY EXCELLENCE

INCREASE DEMAND FOR EXCELLENCE

IMPROVE MATERIALS

BETTER OUTCOMES FOR STUDENTS
Educators created our review tools:

- Incorporated input from a national listening tour of experts and stakeholders
- Designed for consistency with other review tools (i.e. IMET, EQuIP) and informed by state adoption processes

Each review process follows a gateway system:

- Gateways 1 & 2 look for alignment with the standards and the incorporation of the shifts
- Gateway 3 includes indicators around instructional supports and usability
MATH REVIEW CRITERIA

Gateway 1: Focus on Major Work of the grade and coherence.
- Do the instructional materials focus on the CCSS “major work of the grade” and is it coherent both horizontally and vertically?

Gateway 2: Rigor and the Mathematical Practices.
- Do the instructional materials meet the CCSS expectations for rigor (conceptual understanding, procedural knowledge and application)?
- Do the materials meet expectations for implementing the Mathematical Practices?

Gateway 3: Instructional Supports and Other Usability Indicators
- Do the instructional materials support high quality instruction?

“Meets” or “Partially Meets” move to Gateway 2
“Meets” for Gateways 1 & 2, move to Gateway 3
Focus & Coherence

Gateway 1
14 possible points:
12-14 points to “meet expectations,” 8-11 points to “partially meet” and below 8 points “does not meet”

Focus
Criterion 1a

Focus
Criterion 1b

Coherence
Criterion 1c-1f
8 possible points: 7-8 points to “meet expectations,” 5-6 points to “partially meet” and below 5 points “does not meet”
K-8 MATH CRITERIA:
RIGOR AND MATHEMATICAL PRACTICES

Rigor & Mathematical Practice
Gateway 2
18 possible points:
16-18 points to “meet expectations,” 11-15 points to “partially meet” and below 11 points “does not meet”

Rigor & Balance
Criterion 2a-2d
8 possible points: 7-8 points to “meet expectations,” 5-6 points to “partially meet” and below 5 points “does not meet”

Practice-Content Connections
Criterion 2e-2g
10 possible points: 9-10 points to “meet expectations,” 6-8 points to “partially meet” and below 6 points “does not meet”
ELA REVIEW CRITERIA

Gateway 1: Text Quality and Complexity, and Alignment to Standards with Tasks and Questions Grounded in Evidence

- Are quality anchor texts at grade level text complexity? Do they represent the rigor and balance addressed in the standards?
- Are the tasks and questions in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language aligned to grade level standards? Do they support student learning?

Gateway 2: Building Knowledge with Texts, Vocabulary, and Tasks

- Do materials build students' knowledge across topics and content areas?
- Is instruction intentionally and coherently sequenced to build vocabulary?
- Do questions/tasks build to culminating tasks that demonstrate students' ability to analyze components of texts and topic?

Gateway 3: Instructional Supports and Other Usability Indicators

- Does the instructional material support high quality instruction?

“Meets” or “Partially Meets” move to Gateway 2

“Meets” for Gateways 1 & 2, move to Gateway 3
Text Quality and Complexity and Alignment to the CCSS-ELA

Gateway 1

Grades 3-5: 42 possible points. 37-42 points to “meet expectations,” 21-36 points to “partially meet” and below 21 points “does not meet”

Grades 6-8: 36 possible points. 32-36 points to “meet expectations,” 18-31 points to “partially meet” and below 18 points “does not meet”

Text Complexity and Quality

Criterion 1a-1f

18-20 points to “meet expectations,” 10-17 points to “partially meet” and below 10 points “does not meet”

Alignment to the Standards with Tasks and Questions Grounded in Evidence

Criterion 1g-1n

14-16 points to “meet expectations,” 8-13 points to “partially meet” and below 8 points “does not meet”

Tasks and Questions: Foundational Skill Development (Grades 3-5 Only)

Criterion 1o-1q

5-6 points to “meet expectations,” 3-4 points to “partially meet” and below 3 points “does not meet”
BUILDING KNOWLEDGE WITH TEXTS, VOCABULARY, AND TASKS

Gateway 2
32 possible points:
28-32 points to “meet expectations,” 16-27 points to “partially meet” and below 16 points “does not meet”
**Instructional Supports and Usability Indicators**

Gateway 3
36 possible points:
30-36 points to “meet expectations,” 24-29 points to “partially meet” and below 24 points “does not meet”

**Use & Design Facilitate Student Learning**
Criterion 3a-3e
8 possible points: 7-8 points to “meet expectations,” 5-6 points to “partially meet” and below 5 points “does not meet”

**Teacher Planning & Learning for Success with CCSS**
Criterion 3f-3j
8 possible points: 7-8 points to “meet expectations,” 5-6 points to “partially meet” and below 5 points “does not meet”

**Assessment**
Criterion 3k-3n
8 possible points: 7-8 points to “meet expectations,” 5-6 points to “partially meet” and below 5 points “does not meet”

**Differentiated Instruction**
Criterion 3o-3r
10 possible points: 9-10 points to “meet expectations,” 6-8 points to “partially meet” and below 6 points “does not meet”

**Effective Technology Use**
Criterion 3s-3v
Review team composition:

- 5 review team members
- Diverse set of educators (roles, states, grade-level expertise); more than **200+ educators from 46 states**
- Multiple sets of perspectives looking extensively at all elements of the core program; with reviewers touching every page of the materials
- **Over 150 hours of review time per reviewer per series** (3 grades/program), in addition to the final stages of writing and preparing for publishing
Review teams participate in training, are placed in teams, and participate in publisher orientation for assigned review.

Reviewers examine instructional materials independently to gather evidence based on the EdReports.org review tool and evidence guides.

Review teams meet virtually at least weekly to share evidence, discuss ratings with teammates, and write reports over 3-6 months.

Team leads and writers meet weekly to ensure consistency and finalize evidence and scores.

Reviews shared with publishers, feedback considered, and reviews posted along with publisher response.
INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON EDREPORTS.ORG

Compare all titles and grades, look across grade bands within a title, dig into detailed evidence in grade-level reports.
INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON EDREPORTS.ORG

All review tools, evidence guides, and review process details can be found under “Our Approach”

“Materials Under Review” shows the pipeline and how to request specific materials to be reviewed
Since March 2015:

- ~340 grade/course reports posted in K-12 math and ELA

- Hundreds of districts use the information to select materials and plan for implementation (including at least 32 of the 200 largest in the US)

- 13 publishers (and counting) have made substantial revisions based on educator evidence to improve the quality and alignment of their materials

- New trend: recently copyrighted materials are better aligned, including both traditional and OER materials
MOST RECENT MATH REVIEWS

1. **Zearn**
   - Zearn, Inc.
   - Elementary
   - [Show Reports]

2. **Agile Mind**
   - High School Mathematics
   - Agile Mind
   - High School
   - [Show Report]

3. **JUMP Math**
   - JUMP Math
   - Elementary, Middle
   - [Show Reports]

4. **The Utah Middle School Math Project**
   - University of Utah Middle School Math Project
   - Middle
   - [Show Reports]

5. **Mathematics Vision Project (2016)**
   - Mathematics Vision Project
   - High School
   - [Show Report]

6. **Agile Mind Middle School Mathematics**
   - Agile Mind
   - Middle
   - [Show Reports]
EDREPORTS
FINDINGS FROM OUR MATH REVIEWS

Of the programs reviewed:

**High School Series** “met” or “partially met” expectations for Gateways 1 & 2.

**48%**

Middle School series “met” or “partially met” expectations for Gateways 1 & 2.

**40%**

Elementary and K-8 series “met” or “partially met” expectations for Gateways 1 & 2.

**44%**

K-8 reviews are showing improvement in materials’ developing conceptual understanding and presenting meaningful applications. (Rigor)

“When math materials are written specifically to the standards, as opposed to being modified to comply with the standards, we’re finding noticeable improvements.”

Overall decline in replacing mathematical vocabulary with “kid friendly” language in K-8 materials.

Areas for Growth in Materials:

**MATHEMATICAL PRACTICES**
- Opportunities to decide appropriate tool use
- Modeling process incorporated
- Critiquing the reasoning of others

Check out our reviews. Visit www.edreports.org
MOST RECENT ELA REVIEWS

1. **Pearson Literature (2015)**
   - Publisher: Pearson
   - Level: High School
   - See Reports

2. **Holt McDougal Literature (2012)**
   - Publisher: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt
   - Levels: Middle, High School
   - See Reports

3. **Springboard English Language Arts Common Core Edition (2017)**
   - Publisher: College Board
   - Levels: High School
   - See Reports

4. **Developing Core Literacy Proficiencies (2016)**
   - Publisher: Odell Education
   - Levels: Middle, High School
   - See Reports

5. **ARC (American Reading Company) Core (2017)**
   - Publisher: American Reading Company
   - Levels: Elementary, Middle
   - See Reports

6. **Wit & Wisdom (2016)**
   - Publisher: Great Minds
   - Levels: Elementary, Middle
   - See Reports
ELA FINDINGS: TRENDS

EDREPORTS
FINDINGS FROM OUR ELA REVIEWS

- Of the programs reviewed:
  - 50% High School Programs "met expectations" for all 3 gateways.
  - 66% Middle School Programs "met expectations" for all 3 gateways.
  - 69% K-5 or K-6 programs "met expectations" for all 3 gateways.

Middle and high school materials, on average, fare better than K-5/6 programs in the quality of texts used.

"Many programs have the right pieces, they just aren't providing the guidance to teachers that would allow students to build knowledge and get to standard mastery."

Material overload provides challenges to implementation in several programs.

Areas for Growth in Materials:
- Showing growth through the year
- Gradual release of responsibility
- Cross-content cohesion

Check out our reviews. Visit www.edreports.org
In teams, discuss and list the characteristics of high quality materials that matter for your community.

“Our students deserve access to high quality materials that ______”
PLANNING FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION
“Professional learning cannot live up to its potential unless it’s rooted in the content teachers teach in their classrooms. Relevant professional learning using instructional materials should focus in the first instance on making sure the instructional materials reflect the full aspiration of college and career readiness. It’s the professional learning equivalent of ‘you are what you eat.’”

- Weiner and Pimentel, Practice What you Teach, April 2017
THE MATERIALS ADOPTION PROCESS

1. Know District Needs
2. Identify Priorities, Parameters and Decision-Making Process
3. Determine Committee & Communication Plan
4. Engage Community
5. Winnow Choices
6. Apply Local Priorities
7. Make a Decision
8. Create Rollout & Implementation Plan

Evidence-rich reviews
Try to hold off digging into the books until step 6
Advice from other districts

1) **Don’t rush goal-setting and communications** at the front end of the process. Take the time to clearly identify goals, priorities, and how decisions will be made before exploring materials.

2) **Engage teachers and other stakeholders from the outset and often**. Include teachers in the winnowing process using EdReports.

3) **Don’t assume committee participants prioritize the same alignment criteria**. Invest in building shared understanding of quality.

4) If you’re planning to pilot, **develop criteria for piloting by thinking through the standards and shifts**, using the IMET, EquiP Rubrics, and EdReports review language.

5) **Identify potential roll-out and implementation strategies** before you choose.

6) **Invest in professional learning** that goes beyond the “publisher’s one day training”. Consider how you will provide ongoing professional learning in the materials. How will you make the materials come to life for students?
IF YOU’RE CURRENTLY IMPLEMENTING MATERIALS

We know that materials don't come off the shelf perfectly matched to meet all students' needs. What are some things you could do to help support your current implementation?

Use our reports to...

• Pinpoint the strengths and gaps in your materials
• Develop guidance tools and curricular supports
• Highlight areas of need for professional learning opportunities
• Plan for professional learning communities
• Consider where/when supplements might be needed
When you know your materials deeply, you can better identify the best strategy for how to improve these for your students without jeopardizing quality.

- Pedagogical Shifts
- Supplement
- Supplant
- Omit
IF YOU ARE USING LOCALLY DEVELOPED MATERIALS

Make sure your materials are aligned to the standards, the shifts and are high-quality by using our evidence guides. It is excellent professional learning and reflection on whether or not the materials have all of the characteristics that students deserve.

Guidance for Indicator 1a
Criterion: Materials do not assess topics before the grade level in which the topic should be introduced.

Indicator: The instructional material assesses the grade-level content and, if applicable, content from earlier grades. Content from future grades may be introduced but students should not be held accountable on assessments for future expectations.

Are assessment questions addressing grade-level standards?

Purpose of the Indicator:
This indicator, along with 1b, determines the shift of Focus. In order to maintain Focus, materials concentrate on grade-level standards. Assessments are determined by the publisher and are series specific.

Evidence Collection:
Do K-5 assessments include questions addressing the following topics?
(i). Probability, including chance, likely outcomes, probability models.
(ii). 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.
(iii). Similarity, transformations, and congruence.

Do materials include many above-grade items on assessments that would require major modifications to fix?

Do materials include above grade-level items whose removal or modification would change the underlying structure or intent of the materials?

Do materials include above-grade items on assessments that are do not require major modifications to fix or are mathematically reasonable?
NEXT STEPS
High-quality materials allow teachers to "focus their very real and creative energy and expertise on unlocking the potential of the curriculum to meet the particular needs of the students they serve every day."

– Kathleen Porter-Magee
Superintendent, Partnership Schools

Consider this quote and reflect on your previous conversations.

As a team, discuss your next steps for ensuring all teachers and students have access to high quality materials.
Thank you!

Eric Hirsch: Ehirsch@edreports.org

Lauren Weisskirk: Lweisskirk@edreports.org

Audra McPhillips: amcphillips@westwarwickpublicschools.com