

MS Math Adoption Committee

Data Review 4/21/2014

Assessment Data

Group Members	General patterns in the data	Group's interpretations of the data
Jessica Jolly Hope Isitt Sue Kelly	Patterns are hard to discern. Statistically there is really not much difference. Quite a bit of difference in ELL and IEP data.	Data follows teacher comments in the sense that it depends upon which topic or standard is being taught. CF was better for some, BI was better for others. Why is there a difference in the ELL and IEP data? Language? Or math? Based on how close the data is, neither curriculum will be detrimental to student learning. It is unclear which one will be most helpful but it is good to note that it won't "hurt".
Erin Thomas Merrill Tucker Kerry Rogahn	Data feels very inconclusive. Domain content is dramatically different and therefore hard to compare (ie: Geometry vs Algebra and Ratios vs Algebra) Teachers did not have an opportunity to calibrate scoring.	Other data will be more meaningful in making a recommendation.
Abigail, Mary, Faraz	Assessment Data Mix result Gen Ed is close Looking at all student average data, tie Noticed iep Core Focus sixth grade high scores	Assessment Data No clear "winner", both seem to be performing at an acceptable level When Core Focus did well with IEP, it did really well.
Kristen, Eileen, Sarah	In general, Students with IEP & ELL scored higher on Core Focus. The sub category of IEP scores higher on Core Focus (with exception of Volume of a right rectangular).	

MS Math Adoption Committee

Data Review 4/21/2014

Student Survey Data and Comments

Group Members	General patterns in the data	Group's interpretations of the data
Sarah, Eileen, Kristen	<p><u>Student Survey IMT1</u> #9 being able to read the materials is – students that answered “all the time” is 9% higher for Core Focus. #12 Practice Problems- Core focus scored 11% higher than Big Ideas. #14 When absent, 26% of students (7 % higher than Big Ideas) said they understood the math without help.</p> <p><u>Student Survey IMT2</u> No major discrepancies in the survey data.</p> <p><u>Student Survey GMSP IMT1</u> #7 20% more students felt more confident with Core Focus. Survey data not useful for #13- how helpful were the online materials since 91% of Big Ideas did not use it.</p>	<p><u>IMT1</u> We noticed a “It’s boring” theme for the student comments for Big Ideas. Under Core Focus- the student’s comments were very positive about the real-life problems.</p> <p><u>IMT2</u> Negative comments about the Core Focus website glitching- could be a problem with one-to-one technology in the future.</p> <p>Big Ideas comment theme- “boring and easy”.</p> <p><u>GMSP IMT1</u> Comments- Core Focus Tic-Tac-Toe was challenging for students and allowed individual accommodations.</p> <p><u>Student Survey GMSP IMT2</u> Theme of “way too easy” for Core Focus. Website glitches mentioned again.</p>
Abigail, Mary, Faraz	<p>More positives for CF Both spoke to repetitive homework. Concern about size of textbook IMT2 more positive about BI than IMT1</p>	<p>We recognize the student level of confidence in CF as revealed by #7 was as much a 5% favorable to CF rather than BI.</p> <p>We notice #9 reveals the comprehension and retention of what they read was stronger for CF.</p> <p>In the outside of classroom the students reported stronger independent readability in CF.</p> <p>For Gifted program for #7 and #9 suggest confidence and comprehension, CF finishes stronger.</p>

MS Math Adoption Committee

Data Review 4/21/2014

<p>Jessica Jolly Hope Isitt Sue Kelly</p>	<p>Student comments and data are all over the place. EX: <i>"I like the Core Focus packet because it was interesting and even sometimes challenging."</i> Next comment: <i>"I don't really like Core Focus."</i></p> <p><i>"I thought that this book was ok and helped me learn the math."</i> Next comment: <i>"The book was not interesting."</i></p>	<p>There is a lot of individual bias and no clear winner.</p> <p>The percentage data is pretty much even.</p> <p>It is problematic that the Core Focus had so much trouble with their online materials.</p>
<p>Erin Thomas Merrill Tucker Kerry Rogahn</p>	<p>IMT1Data: Data has a slight trend towards CF. Question 8 (interest/culture background) BI had 54% never/not often while CF had 40%.</p> <p>IMT1 Comments: BI had many boring, too hard/too easy CF comments were overall much more positive</p> <p>Gifted: There was not a clear standout here.</p> <p>IMT 2: The numeric trends are similar, other than 3/4 and question 6 (slight less group work in CF and slight less work at interest level in BI)</p> <p>Many of the comments were about the CF online assignments which were unrefined at that point. BI does not have a comparable tool to compare.</p>	<p>IMT1: CF was clearly favored.</p> <p>Gifted: No clear favored curriculum.</p> <p>IMT2: No clear favored curriculum.</p>

MS Math Adoption Committee

Data Review 4/21/2014

Parent Survey Data and Emails

Group Members	General patterns in the data	Group's interpretations of the data
Erin Thomas Merrill Tucker Kerry Rogahn	Survey Results: Little discrepancy between BI and CF in all categories (between 1 and 2%). Most comments from parents were in regards to the survey itself rather than the curriculum. Parent Comments: There were more positive comments from Core Focus. Approximately 25% of parents returned surveys.	Overall, 80% or greater were rated in the 3 positive categories for both. Overall, with the comments, Core Focus was slightly favored.
Eileen, Sarah, Kristen	No patterns in the data.	Both online resources have glitches, more negative comments for Core Focus.
Mary Abigail, Faraz	Both indicate parents responded positively.	Overwhelmingly positive
Hope Isitt Jessica Jolly Sue Kelly	Data is virtually indistinguishable. Percentages are exactly the same in many cases. Comments focus largely on complaining about the format of the survey.	We don't think it was helpful because the percentages were the same and the comments were not text specific. Parents who commented were not familiar with resources or materials.

MS Math Adoption Committee

Data Review 4/21/2014

Teacher Survey Data and Comments

Group Members	General patterns in the data	Group's interpretations of the data
Erin Thomas Merrill Tucker Kerry Rogahn	CF favored on every question (in overall data) The comments were mixed, with slight favor of CF	Overall CF was favored.
Eileen, Sarah, Kristen	Data shows that teachers favor Core Focus in all areas for the survey data. Breakout by Units data- Core focus is higher in three areas with significant differences in the algebraic expression unit. (Engagement and Readability is 5.0 for Core Focus). The rigor for Core Focus was more favorable.	Themes on the comments- Big Idea's assessments did not have enough room for student work. Big Ideas seems to have a better mix of partner work. The content of Core Focus appears favored by teachers and they are willing to supplement the "engagement activities". This favors Core Focus over Big Ideas.
Hope Isitt Jessica Jolly Sue Kelly	Teacher Data: across all rating categories teachers prefer CF. Comments were very mixed and contradictory. The Core Focus Tic-Tac-Toe activities were a huge favorite, lots of comments about how that could be used to differentiate and provide rigor. <i>"Meaning, if we adopted Big ideas, I believe we would take their format, and completely change it...I feel it would be a hug disservice to adopt something that we aren't even going to use in the way it is being recommended to use it."</i> <i>SB: "It is much closer to rich involved questions like the Smarter Balanced assessment than the other pilot. Kids ahd to 'think' when given a rich problem rather than just reciting formulas."</i>	We noticed that the comments about rigor and "teachability" flipped depending upon the unit taught. We think about 60% of teacher comments preferred Core Focus. A lot of teachers commented that they felt a "mixed" response to both of them. There were parts of each curriculum that they liked and parts that they did not, for both CF and BI. Several people commented that CF appeared to align better with Smarter Balance.
Mary, Abigail, Faraz	CI preference overall in the numbers.	We looked at teacher comments and then jumped back to student survey . We recognized that students reported being more engaged in CF by about 3 to 4%.