

## **HAWAII CURRICULUM MATERIALS REVIEW: EVALUATION REPORT**

### **Executive Summary**

Hawaii is one of many states that have adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which were developed through an initiative spearheaded by the nation’s governors and state superintendents. The development of the CCSS 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 BERC 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).

With assistance from The BERC Group, HIDOE engaged in a multi-phase process that analyzed curriculum materials. 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. State 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).

**HAWAII CURRICULUM MATERIALS REVIEW:  
EVALUATION REPORT**

All analyses were conducted using a 4-point scale. An OES of 3.0 or higher was recommended for further consideration for adoption.

After conducting additional research into the programs that met the requirement of a 3.0 or higher OES score, a summary of the findings were reported to the Leadership Team for approval. As a result of the recommendations, the following programs were selected for statewide adoption:

Mathematics

Grades K- 5: ***Stepping Stones***

Grades 6-8: ***Carnegie Learning, College Prep Math, and Go Math***

Grades 9-12: ***HIDOE Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2 Curriculum***

English Language Arts

Grades K- 6: ***Wonders***

Grades 6-12 ***SpringBoard***

## **HAWAII CURRICULUM MATERIALS REVIEW: EVALUATION REPORT**

### **Methodology**

#### **Identification of Materials**

The Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) and The BERC Group worked directly with each publisher's representative(s) to facilitate completion of initial screening criteria and rubrics, which included their self-assessment. The publishers were required to submit the following in order to be considered for review:

1. Submit a "Letter of Intent"
2. Complete a program self-assessment

Programs were then reviewed to determine which materials would advance to the Hawaii Curriculum Review Committee (HCRC). The goal of the 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.

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

Each textbook/program (all grade levels) was reviewed 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.

Each textbook/program was reviewed for alignment with the Common Core State Standards using tools developed by the Charles A. Dana Center at the University of Texas, the Common Core State Standards authors, and the Curriculum Research & Development Group at the University of Hawaii. 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 (HCRC)**

As a result of the preliminary phases of the review process, programs were rank ordered and recommended to move forward for evaluation by the HCRC. The first round of HCRC evaluations was conducted in January 2013. The second round of HCRC evaluations was conducted in April 2013. The third round of HCRC evaluations was conducted in November 2013. The following programs were evaluated by the HCRC:

**HAWAII CURRICULUM MATERIALS REVIEW:  
EVALUATION REPORT**

**Mathematics**

Elementary School (Grades K-5)

- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Go Math!*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Math Expressions*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Math in Focus: Singapore Math Common Core*
- Kendall Hunt – *Math Trailblazers*
- Marshall Cavendish – *Primary Mathematics*
- McGraw Hill – *Everyday Math*
- McGraw Hill – *My Math*
- Origo – *Stepping Stones*
- Pearson – *Envision Math*
- Pearson – *Investigations*

Middle School (Grades 6-8)

- Carnegie Learning – *Carnegie Math*
- College Board – *SpringBoard*
- CORD – *Bridges to Algebra*
- CPM Educational Program – *College Prep Mathematics*
- Glencoe – *Accelerated Math*
- Glencoe/McGraw Hill – *Glencoe*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Big Ideas*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Go Math!*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Holt McDougal Common Core*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Math in Focus: Singapore Math Common Core*
- Kendall Hunt – *Math Innovations*
- Pearson – *Connected Mathematics (CMP 3)*
- Pearson – *Digits*
- Pearson – *Prentice Hall Common Core*
- Perfection Learning – *Kinetic Math*

High School (Grades 9-12: Algebra 1, Geometry and Algebra 2)

- ALEKS – *Algebra 1*
- Carnegie Learning – *Carnegie Math*
- College Board – *SpringBoard*
- CPM Educational Program – *College Prep Mathematics*
- Glencoe /McGraw Hill – *Glencoe*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Holt McDougal Common Core*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Holt McDougal Explorations in Core Math for Common Core*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Larson*
- Kendall Hunt – *Discovering Mathematics*
- Pearson – *CME Project Common Core*
- Pearson Mathematics – *Common Core Edition*

## **HAWAII CURRICULUM MATERIALS REVIEW: EVALUATION REPORT**

### **English Language Arts**

#### Elementary School (Grades K-6)

- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Journeys*
- McGraw Hill – *Wonders*
- National Geographic (Cengage Learning) – *Reach for Reading*
- Scott Foresman – *Reading Street*
- Scholastic Community – *Traits Writing and Reading Curriculum*

#### Secondary School (Grades 6-12)

- Bedford, Freeman and Worth – *Models for Writers (9-12)*
- Bedford, Freeman and Worth – *Patterns for College Writers (9-12)*
- Bedford, Freeman and Worth – *Reflections (9-12)*
- Bedford, Freeman and Worth – *Common Threads (9-12)*
- CICERO Systems – *History Beyond the Textbook (6-12)*
- College Board – *SpringBoard (6-12)*
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – *Holt McDougal Literature: Common Core (6-12)*
- Pearson – *Common Core Literature (6-12)*
- Pearson – *Prentice Hall Writing Coach (6-12)*
- Pearson – *Prentice Hall Literature (6-12)*
- Scholastic – *Expert 21 (6-8)*

## **Reviews Conducted by the Hawaii Curriculum Review Committee (HCRC)**

### **Mathematics**

The mathematics HCRC conducted three rounds of reviews: the first round occurred in January 2013, the second round in April 2013 and the third in November 2013. The mathematics HCRC was comprised of 60 K-12 mathematics teachers, coaches, principals, and district- and state-level resource teachers, representing schools on Hawaii, Kauai, Maui, Molokai and Oahu. HCRC members were led through a facilitated process to review, score, and rank the mathematics programs regarding 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 (ELA)**

The ELA HCRC conducted two rounds of reviews: the first round occurred in February 2013 and the second in April 2013. The HDOE ELA HCRC was comprised of 30 K-12 ELA teachers, coaches,

## **HAWAII CURRICULUM MATERIALS REVIEW: EVALUATION REPORT**

principals, state-level Educational Specialists and resource teachers and higher educational faculty, representing Hawaii, Kauai, Lanai, Maui and Oahu. HCRC members were led through a facilitated process to review, score, and rank the mathematics programs regarding 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 the process for narrowing down the field of textbook/programs that would be reviewed by the HCRC members. Participants were then 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 Mathematics 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 and third rounds of the Mathematics 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

## **HAWAII CURRICULUM MATERIALS REVIEW: EVALUATION REPORT**

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.

### **Hawaii Curriculum Review Committee (HCRC) Findings**

#### **Recommendations**

All analyses reflected in Tables 1 and 2 were conducted using a 4-point scale. A program that received an Overall Evaluation Score (OES) of 3.0 or higher was recommended for further consideration for adoption. The following programs met the 3.0 or higher OES score requirement:

#### 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*

## **HAWAII CURRICULUM MATERIALS REVIEW: EVALUATION REPORT**

None of the high school mathematics programs reviewed met the minimum threshold to be considered for adoption. The HCRC findings indicate that all of the high school mathematics programs reviewed do not adequately address the Common Core content standards and the Standards for Mathematical Practice. As HIDOE is creating its own Algebra 1, Geometry and Algebra 1 curricula that are representative of the teaching and learning expectations of the CCSS, it is recommended that HIDOE utilize and evaluate the implementation of these materials and use teacher feedback to continually refine the curricula.

### **Programs Selected for Statewide Adoption**

After conducting additional research into the programs that met the requirement of a 3.0 or higher OES score, a summary of the findings were reported to the Leadership Team for approval. As a result of the recommendations, the following programs were selected for statewide adoption:

#### Mathematics

Grades K- 5: ***Stepping Stones***

Grades 6-8: ***Carnegie Learning, College Prep Math, and Go Math***

Grades 9-12: ***HIDOE Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2 Curriculum***

#### English Language Arts

Grades K- 6: ***Wonders***

Grades 6-12 ***SpringBoard***