Hawaii Common Core Instructional Materials
Overview and FAQ

1. **What is the Hawaii Common Core?**

The Hawaii Common Core standards define the knowledge and skills students need to succeed in college and careers after they graduate. The standards align with college and workforce expectations, are clear and consistent, include rigorous content and application of knowledge through higher-order skills, are evidence-based, and are informed by standards in top-performing countries. It’s important to note that the *Hawaii Common Core is not curriculum or teaching methods, but standards.* The standards are the learning targets that students are expected to achieve at each grade level. Schools and teachers design the learning experiences that will lead students to achieve the targets specified in the standards.

Put another way, the standards are the goals that students are expected to achieve and the curriculum or instructional materials are tools teachers and schools can use as they innovate to promote student achievement of those goals.

The Hawaii State Department of Education (Department) is deeply committed to full implementation of the rigorous expectations defined in the Hawaii Common Core, known nationally as the Common Core State Standards. The Hawaii Board of Education (BOE) adopted the Hawaii Common Core standards in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics in 2010.

2. **What are instructional materials?**

“Instructional materials” is a broad term for the materials – textbooks, workbooks, and other print and digital materials – used by teachers as part of their instruction.

Instructional materials are not a script, and teachers are not limited to using content from instructional materials. Rather, teachers are encouraged and supported to design innovative learning experiences, fostering creativity for students and to adjust their instruction based upon students’ learning needs (providing interventions for struggling students and extensions for accelerated students.

High quality materials are important tools for educators, but they are not a silver bullet. Effective teaching that meets the needs of all students, engages students in learning, and builds students’ confidence in learning remains the most important strategy for preparing students for success.

3. **Why did the Department decide to require the statewide use of core instructional materials?**

BOE Policy 2240 notes that the Board “understands that implementation of standards-based education requires instructional materials that are aligned with the [Standards].” It states that printed materials, media and technology which overtly address the standards and benchmarks be selected for classroom use and directs the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support (OCISS) to provide a list of recommended instructional materials for curricular areas.

Prior to the selection of common materials, an inventory showed that schools statewide were using 288 unique mathematics and 287 unique English language arts curricula.

The Department believes that providing a consistent set of statewide instructional materials...
aligned to the Common Core will support the transition for educators and students to the new standards. The manifestation of this belief must provide a balance of “standardization” (of high expectation and basic materials for classroom use) and “customization” (through teachers’ individual decisions and instructional practices). Using a consistent set of materials in all classrooms as a common primary resource, teachers are still expected to be innovative and creative to address their students’ learning needs.

Selecting a core set of high quality instructional materials aligned to the Common Core would vastly build our capacity to support teachers’ implementation efforts during this initial transition phase. Among the benefits to the use of consistent core instructional materials during a transition phase:

- **Consistency for students:** Creating more consistency in students’ learning eases transition – when students transfer schools, face teacher turnover, or students move through the K-12 continuum. This importance of this consistency was recently proven in the Kau-Keau-Pahoa complex area in recent months as hundreds of students were reassigned due to the lava flow. Because of the common instructional materials and pacing guides developed, instruction and student support could continue seamlessly.

- **Equity:** Support for the transition should not be less due to poverty or zip code. Common instructional materials provide a floor of equity to ensure all students and educators have access to a foundation of high quality materials aligned to the new standards.

- **Training and professional development:** The use of common materials permitted the Department to leverage efforts at the school, complex area, and state level to better train and support educators.

- **Collaboration among schools:** focused on implementing common materials has the potential to build learning communities and to share best practices across schools.

- **Economies of scale:** Instructional materials must align to the standards – in this case the Common Core. By leveraging state resources to review instructional materials to determine alignment to the standards, schools and teachers did not need to spend the time and money to do this themselves. This is especially true now, as the education marketplace is still transitioning to the Common Core and vendors’ products need to be reviewed to determine the extent of their alignment to the standards.

4. **What and how did the Department select the core instructional materials?**

**Review process**
In 2013, the Department contracted The BERC Group, Inc. to help develop a list of recommended instructional materials, including textbooks and programs that best support digital classroom instruction and assessment related to the Hawaii Common Core for mathematics and for English language arts (ELA).


- The first phase of the process included an initial screening of 71 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. Department officials relied heavily upon the work of the Dana Center and the Common Core State Standards Publisher’s Criteria to set these requirements.

- Of those reviewed during the initial screening process, **31 mathematics and 16 ELA programs** went through a full evaluation. The full evaluation resulted in a recommendation of which programs should 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 analysis, **24 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. 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 following programs met the 3.0 or higher OES:

  **Mathematics**
  - Grades K-5: **Stepping Stones**
  - Grades 6-8: **Carnegie Learning, College Prep Math, and Go Math**
  - Grades 9-12: None

  **English Language Arts**
  - Grades K-6: **Wonders**
  - Grades 6-12 **SpringBoard**

**Selection**
The recommended programs were brought to the state leadership team for a vote of approval by the Complex Area Superintendents (CASs). The decisions were as follows:

For ELA, schools must have purchased and fully implemented these materials by school year 2016-2017:
- Grades K-5/6: McGraw Hill’s *Wonders*; and
- Grades 6-12: College Board’s *Spring Board*.

For mathematics, all schools must have purchased and fully implemented the following materials by school year 2017-2018:
- Grades K-5: Stepping Stones (by Origo);
- Grades 6-8 (including 6th grade at K-6 schools): Go Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt); and
• High school courses: HIDOE-developed Algebra 1, Geometry and Algebra 2 instructional materials.

The Department notified principals of the decision to adopt the core instructional programs.

5. **How has the Department supported the cost of the Common Core materials?**

Through three allocations (July 2013 and May 2014), an additional $26 million in Weighted Student Formula and Impact Aid funds were distributed to schools, with the recommendation to use for the initial year of materials purchases.

Impact Aid collections vary tremendously from year to year and thus are not a reliable or guaranteed funding stream to maintain recurring costs. Schools should not expect additional allocations of Impact Aid in subsequent school years.

6. **Is there a way for schools to use materials other than the selected programs?**

**BOE Policy 2240** requires that there be a process by which schools selecting instructional materials not on the recommended list demonstrate that materials will better support students’ learning needs.

In December 2014, the Department announced an updated process by which schools can select ELA and math instructional materials other than those recommended by the Department for statewide use beginning in School Year 2016-17.

**Process:**

Below is an overview of the process. More details, including forms, will be released at a later date.

**Step A - Submission:** School will submit the following, along with initial approval by their CAS:

1. **Evidence for the materials:**
   a. A full set of the **proposed materials**.
   b. **Rationale,** grounded in student data, of why the school is requesting use of the alternative instructional materials.
   c. **Evidence** of how the proposed materials:
      i. Aligns to the content in the Hawaii Common Core standards;
      ii. Meaningfully engages teaching and learning that are aligned with the ELA Pedagogical Shifts or the Standards for Mathematical Practice;
      iii. Has the capability to provide an online, interactive, digital component.
   d. A completed **Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool (IMET) Report.**
      i. The IMET is a tool developed by the Common Core authors, Achieve, Inc., and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to evaluate whether instructional materials are aligned to the Common Core.
      ii. IMET can be used with ELA/literacy materials for grades K-2 or 3-12 and for mathematics materials K-8 or high school and can be found at: [http://achievethecore.org/page/783/instructional-materials-evaluation-tool-imet](http://achievethecore.org/page/783/instructional-materials-evaluation-tool-imet)

2. **An Implementation Plan that includes:**
   i. Budget, including the Program ID/Title and amount that will be used;
   ii. Professional development for teachers;
iii. How the school plans to show vertical alignment within their complex area and address the K-12 construct; and
iv. What data will be used to determine the effectiveness of the program.

**Eligibility**
A school may not request a program that was previously reviewed and not approved by the state. A list of such programs is included in the Review Process report. If a previously approved program has been updated, the school must also provide evidence that proposed program has been revised since the initial review period.

**Step B – Committee Technical Review and Recommendation**

Requests will be submitted to a review committee, which will convene annually in the fall. The review committee will be comprised of subject matter experts (SMEs), at least one teacher and at least one educational officer. The committee will use the Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool (IMET) Report to review the proposed program. During that period, additional data and information may be requested from the school.

The Committee will provide the results of its review and recommendations to the CAS.

**Step C – Committee Recommendation to CAS for Decisionmaking**

Recommendations will be made to the CAS for final decisions. Final decisions will be provided to the school in advance of the Financial Plan deadlines and for implementation in the 2016-17 school year.

7. **How will this exception process affect schools that are already implementing the selected program?**

Schools that have are already implementing the selected program will not be impacted. They may continue to use the selected programs, or consider submitting a request for an exception.

8. **Why was this exception process not released at time the mandate was announced?**

We believe during the initial transition to the new standards, educators and students would be best served by using common instructional materials that would support consistency, equity, collaboration, and high-quality professional development statewide.

There are limited options for Common Core-aligned materials that met our criteria. The Department conducted a rigorous, iterative review of submitted instructional materials. No materials met the criteria during the first round of review. Subsequent rounds resulted in recommended selections for English language arts (Wonders for K-6, and Springboard for 6-12) and Mathematics (Stepping Stones for K-5, and Carnegie Learning, College Prep Math and Go Math for 6-8).

At this point, it's important to update the existing procedure for requesting exceptions to allow schools additional room for customization in the case that they have alternative materials that meet the rigorous criteria.