

Companies Reviewed:

Pearson envision2.0

- The committee reported that enVisions 2.0 is of very high quality. (This included both the text and online materials.) The committee looked very closely at these materials and found that the program provided both the text and online materials that will support our students as they learn to master and demonstrate mathematical skills required by the Nevada State Standards.
 - The committee found the materials aligned closely to the Districts MIU and student data tracking structure. With some revision and updates the materials could be inserted into the current curriculum model and in essence align our students with the college and career ready requirements that are set before them.
 - The committee was pleased with the rigor of the materials and believes that it will be used to effectively elevate the knowledge and skills of students that are served.
 - The alignment of the product to Nevada State Standards was very high and the depth of knowledge expected also resonated with the committee.
 - The materials provide an excellent teaching and learning pathway for stakeholders. It should support the adoption of common core practices.
 - The online platform had some very strong parts, and is accessible from a single point of entry.
 - Similar to the online information shared above, the data management systems required multiple access points, thus making it more difficult to utilize the quality features identified.
 - As part of the review process teachers taught specific lessons to a wide variety of students, committee members reported very good results, but were most pleased with the interaction of some of the lower functioning groups. Students who do not usually operate well in the deeper thinking and conversation activities did very well in that area. The process of activating prior knowledge and bringing students into the lesson worked very well when utilizing these materials.
- The committee was very pleased with this system of materials and believes that it can be used to elevate the rigor, expectations and performance of students and teachers who utilize these materials as part of the Districts learner centered approach to mathematics education

McGraw Hill Glenco Math 6-8:

- The committee felt the Glenco math products were of very high quality. In addition the service and projected service that the company would provide appeared to be very strong. (This included both the text and online materials.) The committee looked very closely at these materials but found several challenges to using the materials within our current unit structure.
 - The products had an aligned focus on essential standards but the committee felt that it lacked some rigor when considering learning experiences aligned with state standards and common core expectations. Moving to common core practices will require some significant shifts in practice, the committee felt that the product did not support some of the more intricate changes teachers would need to make to effectively lead their classrooms and support student learning opportunities within them.
 - This product provided a more traditional approach to mathematics, and this did not match the committee recommendations for supporting the work of our students as they move toward common core or Nevada Academic Content Standards based experiences.
 - The online platform had some very strong parts, but had to be accessed from many locations. The committee determined this multiple access point might be challenging for teachers, thus reducing the possibility of teachers and students accessing it effectively.

- Similar to the online information shared above, the data management systems required multiple access points, thus making it more difficult to utilize the quality features identified.

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – Go Math

- The committee reported that the “Go Math” series was a high quality product and did identify the product as a finalist in the review process. The committee highlighted the following items in the review as challenges that would exist if the series was selected:
 - The Go Math series had many higher level thinking opportunities but did not provide enough practice and did not have enough mathematics fluency opportunities for students to reach mastery within the unit structure. This was particularly true for students who would need remediation or multiple attempts to master the content within the unit.
 - The process of creating online assessments with Go Math system tools were not as SBAC aligned as the committee had recommended and the system was difficult for teachers to create and adjust assessments using the system.
 - The materials did not easily align with the current unit structure. Although our current system will require revision, the revision associated with this series would be significantly more difficult than other materials reviewed in this process.
 - The newest version of these materials are underdevelopment and are not currently available for the district to implement.

Pearson Connected Mathematics 6-8

- The committee recognized that there were some high quality components to this system, but there were some significant challenges that would exist if the District chose to select this vendor.
 - The development and organizational system highlighted within this product did not align with districts current MIU structure. The committee felt that selection of this product would require a complete reconstruction of our current system. This would be time and cost prohibitive, and would also make it very difficult to utilize the District’s Mastery Connect System.
- Although the topics were common core aligned, the committee felt that the materials did not match teacher or student needs when they would be moving through the process to master common core expectations.

Big Ideas Math – Advanced 1, Advanced 2, Course 2 Accelerated

- The committee reported that the Big Ideas Math did provide some quality materials there were challenges the committee recognized if the product was selected:
 - The product was designed to utilize a very traditional approach to mathematics instruction. The committee believes that the approach to common core instruction will require a shift to allow students to learn both traditional math skills as well as common core related skills. The committee stated that this product did not provide enough common core like experiences to serve the needs of both the students and the teachers.
 - The use of the product would require the District staff to move away from the personalized learning model to effectively use the products, and this would push the District away from the teaching and learning experiences it is currently striving to adopt and improve.

Eureka Math

- The committee did report there were some very strong components to this product, there were areas that would create hardship for the district if the materials were adopted.
 - The development and organizational system for this product did not align with districts current MIU structure. The committee members were not sure all the items emphasized in the Nevada State Standards, could be addressed through this product.
 - In addition, the product would require extensive labor to adjust the program to our current MIU and student data structure.

ConnectedEd

- The committee did report there were some very strong components to this product, there were areas that would create hardship for the district if the materials were adopted.
 - The development and organizational system for this product did not align with districts current MIU structure. The committee members were not sure all the items emphasized in the Nevada State Standards, could be addressed through this product.
 - In addition, the product would require extensive labor to adjust the program to our current MIU and student data structure.

Carnegie Learning

- The committee did report there were some very strong components to this product, there were areas that would create hardship for the district if the materials were adopted.
 - The development and organizational system for this product did not align with districts current MIU structure.
 - In addition, the product would require extensive labor to adjust the program to our current MIU and student data structure.
 - The committee reported that these materials were not a good match for our Districts mathematics program.

Middle School Math Solutions

- The committee did report there were some very strong components to this product, there were areas that would create hardship for the district if the materials were adopted.
 - The development and organizational system for this product did not align with districts current MIU structure.
 - In addition, the product would require extensive labor to adjust the program to our current MIU and student data structure.
 - The committee reported that these materials were not a good match for our Districts mathematics program.

As noted in the above responses, the District has done extensive work on the MIU curriculum and assessment structure. This includes alignment with learning targets, learning guides, and student mastery data tracking systems. These systems allow the District and key stakeholders the ability to track student mastery in real time. In order to take advantage of this system, the new curriculum materials must fit within that structure to meet the needs of teachers and students in the District. If the materials provided by the vendors was to far away in terms of content and scope, then the curriculum materials would not work for application within the Districts current system. Thus many of the responses above center on that challenge and were central to the collection, review, and adoption process.