EM4 Pilot Teacher Survey - January 2016

- 43 out of 50 teachers responded
- All three elementary schools well represented
- All six grade levels well represented
- There were five sections to survey (Math Content, Pedagogy & Activities, Materials, Assessments, and Curriculum Overall)
- Mostly, teachers rated on a scale from 1 (very low) - 5 (very high) - see graphs
- Teachers also gave comments - see summaries
- Teachers also did the survey in October 2015 (added question in January about recommendation)
- ESC will review data and discuss recommendation
Alignment with the Common Core
Math Practice Standards
Common Core Vocabulary

- None: 1 (0%)
- 2: 0 (0%)
- 3: 2 (4.7%)
- 4: 8 (18.6%)
- Very High: 5 (33) (76.7%)
Comments

“The math content is very aligned with the Common Core and the math practice standards are integrated into many lessons. I especially like the Open Response lessons, which have students look at examples and explain their thinking."

“The math content is developmentally appropriate for second grade. I feel lessons provide adequate rigor for most students. Differentiation ideas/activities are relevant and meaningful, providing both practice and remediation for those students who need extra support. I love the spiral, so that students see the same concepts/skills again at increasing levels of complexity. This program connects so well to the Common Core, I find very little need for ancillary materials/lessons."

“I have found the curriculum to be skillfully and thoroughly aligned with the grade 5 Common Core math standards."

“Content seems on target for CC though the spiral doesn't always allow for depth, which is key in kindergarten as things take a while to sink in and click for students."

“I like that several of the big third grade concepts like multiplication, division, area and perimeter are introduced earlier in the school year. There is a nice range of skills and content taught and overall the content is framed in a more rigorous way than other programs I have taught."
Pedagogy & Activities
### Engaging Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Very High:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaborative Student Work

- None: 1 (0%)
- 2: 0 (0%)
- 3: 7 (16.3%)
- 4: 23 (53.5%)
- Very High: 5 (30.2%)
Practice with Key Concepts
Spiral Review

None: 1  3  7%
2: 0  0%
3: 5  11.6%
4: 19  44.2%
Very High: 5  16  37.2%
Connections to Literature

- None: 4 (11.1%)
- 2: 6 (16.7%)
- 3: 14 (38.9%)
- 4: 11 (30.6%)
- Very High: 5 (2.8%)
Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High: 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

“The games are excellent. Very engaging and kids love to play them over and over. I like the spiral review, but sometimes I wish we had another day or two on a concept before switching gears. It is important to build in flex days to go back to concepts that kids need more exposure to.”

“Students report that they like this year's math better than the ones before. Many of the games are engaging as students practice the content.”

“Pedagogy appears developmentally appropriate. I find the lessons in the teacher's manual language heavy. Too many words for children with language issues. I have simplified the pedagogy, added color, and images in our Promethian software and present all lessons on the active board. The language, pedagogy, and activities come straight from the lesson plan in the teacher's manual. The digital presentation makes the lessons more motivating and easier to access for all students, especially this with language issues.”

“The activities and games are very engaging and enjoyable for the students, while also being educational and standards-based. The units provide examples of literature but they are not integrated into the lesson. It would be nice to have the literature integrated, or at least as part of the Readiness, Extra Practice, or Enrichment activities.”

“Some lessons feel quite teacher-directed, however I think much of that is my own newness with the curriculum. There are always more than enough instructional activities to fill our daily math block.”
Materials
Quality of Student Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low: 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High: 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ease of Use of Student Materials
Quality of Teacher Materials

- Low: 1 0 0%
- 2 4 9.3%
- 3 6 14%
- 4 21 48.8%
- Very High: 5 12 27.9%
Ease of Use of Teacher Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality of Tech Tools for Teachers

![Bar chart showing ratings: 1: 2.4%, 2: 14.3%, 3: 35.7%, 4: 35.7%, 5: 11.9%]
Quality of Tech Tools for Students

- Low: 1, 0% (0 students)
- Medium: 2, 17.1% (6 students)
- Medium-High: 3, 37.1% (13 students)
- High: 4, 34.3% (12 students)
- Very High: 5, 11.4% (4 students)
Quality of DI Resources

- Low: 0 (0%)
- 2: 0 (0%)
- 3: 14 (33.3%)
- 4: 14 (33.3%)
- Very High: 5 (33.3%)
“There is an abundance of materials available for teachers and students. The online tools are constantly developing and I think will be a noteworthy strength of the program. The enrichment activities are good, but most are quickly completed by my strong math students. There are a few challenging math projects available online, but their quality and relevance are variable.”

“Our district missed the technology training so it has been some quick learning on my part. I would like a whole professional day on the technology training. Some of it works well. Some of it does not move easily.”

“The technology piece is not as strong as I would like to see, but with our flipcharts which the grade level has developed, we are doing very well. I was recently told the online flipcharts have improved, but they often seems to take too long to load from one frame to the next.”

“The materials can be cumbersome given the large amount of papers to be copied for daily lessons. However, this is still manageable. I like the student journals and the manipulatives, especially the fraction pieces.”

“I really like the spiral. The introduction and repeated practice of fundamental concepts is great. It meets the students' ever developing understanding of math vocabulary and concepts and provides for experience to take hold. The games and materials engage a variety of learning styles. They are multi sensory and fun! Teacher tips for dealing with ELL students are useful.”
Assessments
Quality of Formative Assessments

- Low: 1 (2.4%)
- 2 (2.4%)
- 3 (19.5%)
- 4 (61%)
- Very High: 5 (14.6%)
Quality of Summative Assessments
Quantity of Summative Assessments

- Too few: 0 (0%)
- Just right: 26 (63.4%)
- Too many: 15 (36.6%)
Comments

“There are many assessments, both formative and summative. Open response questions are also part of the program. It does seem that we assess the students often. The assessments themselves are appropriate and address the learning that has taken place.”

“I like having multiple parts to the assessment (unit, cumulative, challenge, open response).”

“The scope and sequence of administering the assessments at the beginning, middle and end of year are developmentally appropriate and valuable as teaching tools. I do feel that the assessments are quite lengthy and could be streamlined a little bit.”

“Does the format of unit assessments mirror what students will see on PARCC or MCAS II”
Curriculum Overall
Strengths of the Program

“**Developmentally appropriate *Well-connected to the Common Core *Sound pedagogy *Variety of multi sensory materials *Appropriate to a variety of learning styles *Instructional pacing manageable *Assessments plentiful *Assessments are reliable and valid”

“I think the spiral is integral to helping students retain learned math concepts across multiple units. It is especially important for students on IEPs. My students’ anxiety around math has decreased knowing that we are consistently reviewing previously learned concepts.”

“Big fan of Everyday Math and it's multitude of components. Each unit I learn more and more about how to utilize the various components effectively to deliver high quality instruction and materials.”

“Problems are more rigorous. Spiral review (especially math boxes) keeps concepts fresh in minds of students. Many online materials are helpful for teachers. Offers opportunities for students to explore concepts before explicit instruction to pique their interest and allow for more critical thinking opportunities.”

“Strengths include the alignment to the Common Core and the abundance of materials for teachers and students. The online features are great and the ability to take and score assessments online in the future and to track student progress digitally is fantastic. I strongly feel that EM4 is the right choice going forward.”
“I have been disappointed in the training. I feel we have been left to figure a lot of things out on our own. It has been challenging trying to integrate all the components of the program.”

“If EM4 is chosen, it would be wonderful to have some summer work available to make/create some of the activities/games for future implementation, etc. and to share ideas with colleagues.”

“Getting used to spiral review. Teaching basic concepts need to be focused on first as a solid foundation before moving on to other skills (e.g. writing numbers and 1:1 counting skills).”

“Developmentally inappropriate. Not enough counting. It is not designed to fit the flow of a kindergarten structure. In other words, it doesn't lend itself to center work. “

“The online resources are extensive and it's difficult to locate materials due to overall layout and structure of the site itself. Once you find what you're looking for however, it's terrific.”
Recommendations from Pilot Teachers

Which math program would you recommend?

- Everyday Math 4: 31 (72.1%)
- Investigations 3: 4 (9.3%)
- Abstain: 8 (18.6%)
Next steps

Communicate recommendation

Plan for professional development

Plan for purchasing and materials distribution (teachers have materials over summer)

Plan for summer work

Plan for assessments

Other...?