

**Superintendent's  
Input into Mathematics Survey - 1999**

Superintendent Bob Christal requested that the Assessment and Evaluation Department conduct a survey of elementary teachers, middle level math teachers, and elementary principals to seek their opinions about the Anchorage School District Elementary math program. Surveys were developed by the Curriculum and Evaluation Department in early May 1999 and distributed with a letter from the Superintendent on May 18, 1999, about two weeks prior to the end of the school year.

Given the time of the survey, there was a substantial return from teachers and principals. Five hundred and fifty-nine elementary teachers responded with from 1 to 17 teachers mailing in surveys from each of 56 elementary schools. Thirty-eight elementary principals responded.

Three of the responding schools report using the Heath math program. One reports using Saxon math. One reports using Scott Foresman math. The remainder of the schools represented in the survey, 51, use EveryDay Math throughout the school.

The statistical breakdowns of the survey are presented in Appendices A through E. The comments of teachers and principals are attached to this report as Appendices F through H. The text of the report summarizes and high lights the statistics and notable comments.

**The Response of Elementary Teachers to the Anchorage School District Math Program.**

While the input on math survey took place late in the year, the substantial return and detailed comments show that teachers and principals have strong feelings about the ASD math program. There are slight differences in the responses of elementary teachers based on the grade level of the teacher, the length of time the program has been in use in the school, and school in which the teachers work. Because of the large number of teachers that responded, all of these differences are statistically significant for some items.

Most the teachers and schools report using the EveryDay Math program (85 percent). There were 56 teachers that indicated that their school used Heath and 26 indicated that they used Saxon or Scott Foresman.

Almost all of the teachers, 502, reported using some form of supplemental materials. One hundred and seventy eight, 36% of those that said they used supplemental materials, indicated that they used EveryDay Math supplements. One hundred and fifty nine indicated that they used materials that they had developed or purchased. One hundred and thirty indicated that they used Silver Burdett as a supplement. Thirty-five indicated that they used ASD prepared supplemental

materials. Comments and responses to a later survey question indicate that some of the teachers that indicate using the EDM supplemental materials were in fact using the ASD computational supplement.

EveryDay Math teachers are likely to use supplements. About equal numbers use their own materials, EDM materials, and Silver Burdett materials. About two out of three of the teachers using Heath Mathematics, use EveryDay Math materials to supplement. Teachers using other programs are most likely to use either their own materials or EveryDay Math materials as supplements.

About 70 percent of the teachers indicate that they have been using the same math program for the past two or three years. Seventy-seven teachers used their school program for the first time this year and 86 indicated that they have been using the same program for four or more years. More than half of the teachers had just finished their first or second year using their current math program. Of the 76 teachers that were new to using their math program this year, 60 were using EveryDay Math.

About 60 percent of the teachers indicate that they enjoy using the program selected at their school and about 40 percent do not. The lowest rate of enjoyment is with EveryDay Math where 55 percent indicate they enjoy using the program. Sixty-three percent of the 55 Heath teachers and 88 percent of the 26 teachers using other programs agree that they are enjoy using the program.

About 77 percent indicate that they have had training in the math program they are using, about 23 percent do not. Most of the EveryDay Math teachers, 84 percent, indicate that they have had training though only 28 percent strongly agree with this item suggesting that some of these teachers may feel a need for more training. Only 41 percent of the 55 Heath teachers and 60 percent of the 25 other program teachers report that they have had training in the program that they are using. The responses to this item suggest that there are still notable training needs in elementary mathematics.

About 63 percent of teachers indicate that they feel the program they are using helps students understand underlying math concepts, about 37 percent do not. Sixty percent of EveryDay Math teachers, 69 percent of Heath teachers, and 84 percent of other program teachers feel that the need of students to understand the underlying concepts of mathematics are being met.

About 40 percent of the teachers indicate that they feel the program they are using helps students understand math facts and needed computation skills, about 59 percent do not. Thirty-four percent of EveryDay Math teachers, 62 percent of Heath math teachers, and 85 percent of other program teachers feel that the need of students to understand math facts and develop computation skills are being met. A number of teachers comment that they are working to supplement student skill

development through the use of materials they have developed, ASD supplemental materials, or other purchased materials.

About 60 percent of the teachers indicate that students enjoy the math program they are using, about 37 percent do not. Sixty percent of the EveryDay Math teachers, 67 percent of Heath teachers, and 89 percent of other program teachers feel students enjoy learning with the program. A number of teachers indicate that students that have not moved up through the EveryDay Math spiral curriculum due to the program being new at the school, teachers in their school not consistently teaching the curriculum, or students being new to the school. Some felt that it was hard for students that have to catch up.

Most teachers find the math program that they use to be consistent with state and ASD standards. Twenty-three percent "strongly agree" and 45 percent "agree" that our programs are consistent with the current standards. About 29 percent of teachers disagree and some comment that more must be done to align instruction with standards.

Sixty-three percent of the teachers feel that students are learning math using the current programs, 35 percent do not. Thirty-nine percent of EDM teachers, 18 percent of Heath teachers, and 12 percent of teachers from other programs feel students are not learning. Some of these teachers comment on the need for supplemental materials, the need for more teacher training, and the difficulty that students with low level math skills have in learning math.

Teachers at EveryDay Math schools were asked if they use the ASD prepared supplemental materials to help students master computation skills. Fifty-eight percent reported using the materials.

Among those that do not use the materials, some reported that they are using materials that they have developed on their own. Others did not seem to be familiar with the ASD prepared materials.

Teachers made many thoughtful comments and it is recommended that you review Appendix F. Here are a few of the points that were raised about EveryDay Math.

- Teachers need more training. Some teachers indicate that the program takes a substantial effort to learn and to develop into an effective pattern of lessons. A few teachers comment that they found the curriculum difficult at the start but effective after they learned to use it.
- Some teachers felt that the program had not been in place long enough to make a judgement and needed more time. Some of these teachers felt that they need more training and more time to understand the materials. Some of these teachers felt that students need more time to master the program or that some

teachers were still inconsistent in their use of the program so that students had "gaps" in their knowledge that were difficult to fill.

- Some teachers on military base schools and schools with high turnover rates had many students with "gaps" because of lack of prior exposure to the curriculum. Some spoke of the difficulty of working with students that had "gaps" and keeping up with the instruction of other students.
- Some teachers commented on the problems with low ability math students that struggle to understand the math concepts presented and stressed in EveryDay Math. Some teachers from schools that have lower overall math achievement described EveryDay Math as being for gifted students and demanding too many higher order thinking skills.
- Some teachers commented that EveryDay Math is consistent with state and local standards and that students that do well on EveryDay Math will do well on the CAT and state benchmark tests. Some kindergarten teachers felt that EveryDay Math was not consistent with kindergarten expectations.

Teachers using the Heath program and other programs were generally positive about the programs that they were using. Some of these teachers commented on the need to supplement the materials to improve student computation skills.

### **The response of elementary principals to the Anchorage School District Math program.**

Thirty-eight of the elementary principals responded with their opinions on the Anchorage School District mathematics program. Thirty-three of the principals indicated that their school is using EveryDay Math. Three schools were using Heath. Scott Foresman math and Saxon math were each used by one school.

Thirty seven of the principals report that supplemental math materials are being used. Fourteen report using ASD supplemental materials. Nine use their own or teacher developed materials. Seven use Silver Burdett and seven use EveryDay Math materials.

Most schools, 31, are in the second or third year of using their current math program. One school adopted the EveryDay Math program last year. Three schools are in the fourth year of using EDM and one principal reported that they had been using EDM for six years.

Thirty-one principals feel that their school has a high quality math program, five do not. The five principals that do not feel that the math program is of high quality report using EveryDay Math. Two principals did not answer the question on program quality.

Twenty-nine of the principals, 76 percent of those responding, report that they have had training in the math program used at their school. Six indicate that they have

not had training and three did not answer the question. Three of the principals reporting that they did not have training are at EDM schools and three are at Heath schools.

All of the principals feel that the program in use at their school helps students to come to understand math concepts. Half of the EDM principals very strongly agree that the program helps with concepts while the other half of the EDM principals and all other program principals just agree that their programs support students learning math concepts. Twenty-three of the principals, 62 percent, feel that their program helps students to learn the basic math facts and computational skills while 13, 35 percent, feel that their program does not. The principals that do not feel that the program supports learning math facts and skills are all at EDM schools. Two principals chose not to answer.

Most of the principals, 70 percent, think that teachers enjoy using the math program. Eleven of the thirty-seven principals that responded, 30 percent, indicate that the teachers at their school do not enjoy using the math program. Twenty-two of the EDM principals felt their teachers enjoyed the program while 10 did not. The principal of the school using Scott Foresman felt teachers did not enjoy using the program.

Most of the principals, 65 percent, feel that the teachers at their school need more training in the math program. Eleven principals feel that their teachers have had enough training. Twenty-three principals at EDM schools, 72 percent of EDM principals, felt their teachers needed more training as did the principal of the school using Saxon math. None of the principals at the Heath or Scott Foresman schools felt that more training was needed.

Most of the principals, 89 percent, feel that the math program is consistent with local and state standards. Four principals at schools using EDM did not feel the program was consistent with standards or was not consistent at the lowest grade levels.

Thirty-four of the thirty-eight principals indicate that their students are learning the math they need with the current program. Two principals at EDM schools did not feel that students were getting what they need.

Principals at schools using the EveryDay Math program were asked if they were using the ASD supplemental materials prepared to support teachers in the instruction of math facts and computation. Twenty-seven principals, 90 percent of those using EDM, indicated that their school was using the ASD supplemental materials. Three indicated that their school was not.

Principals made a number of thoughtful comments on a variety of issues that surround the implementation of the ASD math program at their school. Many of the comments from principals are similar to those of their teachers. Here are some of the highlighted issues:

- The EveryDay Math program was a substantial change from prior instructional practice and it will take time to prove effective. Don't make any changes to the math program for the next few years.
- Teachers need more support and training to be comfortable teaching EveryDay Math. There needs to be more inservice support. There needs to be more training in the use of EDM materials. There needs to be more training in the use of ASD supplemental materials.
- Teachers and parents are still making comments on the lack of computation in EveryDay Math. There needs to be better public relations about the success of the program and the ASD computational materials.
- EveryDay Math is a challenging program. It is difficult if it is not consistently taught. It is difficult for students that are new to the district and have not learned the math concepts as they have moved forward through the grades.
- EveryDay Math is difficult for lower level students. Math concepts are hard for some students to master.
- The program works well. I have seen great changes in my students. The program is consistent with the CAT test and scores are good.
- EveryDay Math is a difficult program for teachers to learn because it is not like traditional math programs. EveryDay Math is hard for teachers but good for students.
- There needs to be more of a focus on math standards rather than specific programs. Good teachers will make any program a success.
- Additional training is needed for the Heath program. The Scott Foresman program needs better alignment at a few grade levels.

**The response of middle level math teachers to the Anchorage School District Math program.**

All of the middle level mathematics teachers were sent input surveys. Surveys were returned by 32 teachers. From 1 to 7 teachers responded from each of the 8 large Anchorage middle schools.

The middle level teachers indicated all of the grades of math they instructed. Three indicated they primarily taught grade 6 courses. Sixteen primarily teach grade seven and thirteen primarily teach grade 8. Courses taught include grade 6 math, math 7, math 8, pre-algebra, and algebra. Years of teaching experience range from one to more than six.

Twenty-four of the teachers, 75 percent of those responding, indicated that they felt familiar with the math program for grade 6. Six teachers indicated that they did not feel familiar with the program at earlier grades and 2 teachers did not answer the question.

Because of the differences in conceptual understanding of mathematics and skills required for entry into middle level mathematics courses, teachers were asked about the conceptual readiness of students entering into the various courses. Forty percent of the middle level math teachers felt students that come into math 7 have the conceptual understanding needed for the class, 60 percent felt that students were not ready. Forty-eight percent felt the students that enter pre-algebra are ready, 52 percent felt that they are not ready. Forty one percent felt the students that enter algebra are ready, 59 percent felt that they are not ready.

Teachers were also asked about the computational skills that they felt students had developed. Teachers indicated that they felt only 19 percent of math 7 students, 32 percent of pre-algebra students, and 33 percent of algebra students had the computational skills needed for the various classes. However, teachers were split in answering a question about the need for increased emphasis on computational skills rather than math concepts. Fifty four percent favored a greater emphasis on computation while 46 percent supported the current balance of computation and concepts for instruction in the earlier grades.

Middle level teachers made a number of comments about the elementary program and shared their feelings about the needs of students. Here are some of the major ideas shared by teachers.

- The EDM program is new. The program needs more support and time.
- Students are showing more conceptual understanding and better logical skills with the EDM program but it is still too early to make a judgement.
- Many students come to grade 7 without the conceptual and computational skills they need for success.
- A remedial math program is needed for students that have not mastered the basic skills by the time that they arrive at grade 7. Many students need better computational and conceptual skills.
- Teachers that are new to Anchorage or not familiar with the elementary math program felt there needs to be more training and better communication of expectations among middle level and elementary teachers.

## **Conclusions**

All elementary teachers, elementary principals, and middle level math teachers were surveyed to ascertain their opinions about the Anchorage elementary school math program. Even though the survey took place in the last two weeks of the school year, a substantial number of teachers and principals took the time to share their feelings.

Elementary teachers are mixed in their feelings about the elementary math program. Teachers using the EveryDay Math program report that the program is

still new, that they are still learning the program, and that the program is different than prior math programs. Many teachers feel that they need more training and that more consistency is needed in the implementation of the program.

Teachers shared a number of concerns about the EveryDay Math program. Many teachers feel that there is a need to supplement the program to help student develop computational skills. Some teachers are concerned for students that are not consistently exposed to the program as they move through the grades and that students that are new to Anchorage have to catch up. These students are felt to have "gaps" in their experience and a special effort is needed to help these students develop the mathematical concepts that are introduced to Anchorage students in the early grades. Some teachers are concerned that the program is demanding and difficult for lower achieving students. The need to help students catch up makes EveryDay Math a more difficult program for teachers to use.

Some teachers report substantial success with EDM and feel that their students are developing more advanced conceptual and computational skills. Teachers feel that the program is closely aligned with state, national, and local goals and should help students do well on CAT and state benchmark exams.

Teachers using other district programs are generally positive about those programs. Scott Foresman teachers indicate that there are alignment problems at some grades. Heath program teachers indicate a need for more training. Many teachers using other district programs indicate a need for training and support. Most teachers using other programs indicate that they are using additional materials to supplement the programs.

Some teachers commented on the need for additional allocations for supplies and copies. A few did not seem to have the resources they felt they needed to copy supplemental materials for students.

Most teachers feel that their students are learning the conceptual skills and computational skills that they need for success.

Principals indicate mixed feelings about the district math program though most feel that the programs are effective in teaching students the knowledge and skills needed. Many report that teachers need more training and support.

A number of principals indicated that the EveryDay Math program needed more time for implementation though a number reported seeing positive effects. Most of the principals indicated that the teachers in their schools were using either their own materials or ASD developed materials to supplement EDM in the area of computation.

Some principals raised questions about the efficacy of the program in military base and high turnover schools where students may not benefit from the multi-year

effect of the spiral curriculum in math. Some indicated that there were problems because new students had not mastered the same level of concepts and had "gaps" to fill.

Principals in both EDM and other program schools emphasized the need for continuing training and support.

Middle level math teachers feel that students need additional computational and conceptual skills for success in grade 7. Those teachers familiar with the curriculum at lower grades felt that the math program needed more time for implementation. Some commented that students exposed to the new program had better conceptual and logical skills. Others indicated that they felt that there had been a decline in computational skills and more emphasis on computation is needed. Some felt that there was a need for a remedial 7<sup>th</sup> grade math class for those students that were not ready for the rigor required in middle level math courses.

A general conclusion might be that overall things are good, but many feel that things could be better. To quote from a teacher, "The EveryDay Math program is hard for teachers but good for students." However, there are real concerns about the "gaps" in the education of students that do not have consistent instruction in the program as they move through the grades or come new to the Anchorage School District. New students and lower ability students appear to struggle to master the concepts and catch up with average and continuing students. Teachers are generally positive about the other programs in use in the district but almost all teachers and principals feel that there is a need for more training and support.

**Appendix A**  
**Elementary Teacher Responses to**  
**Elementary Mathematics Survey**  
**Spring 1999**

**Frequencies of Responses by Individual Question**

**School of Teacher**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Abbott Loop	100.00	3	.5	.6	.6
Airport Heights	110.00	11	2.0	2.0	2.6
Alpenglow	112.00	10	1.8	1.8	4.4
Aurora	114.00	13	2.3	2.4	6.8
Baxter	115.00	7	1.3	1.3	8.1
Bayshore	116.00	14	2.5	2.6	10.6
Bear Valley	118.00	6	1.1	1.1	11.7
Birchwood ABC	120.00	2	.4	.4	12.1
Bowman	125.00	9	1.6	1.7	13.8
Campbell	130.00	16	2.9	2.9	16.7
Chester Valley	140.00	14	2.5	2.6	19.3
Chinook	150.00	14	2.5	2.6	21.8
Chugach Optional	160.00	2	.4	.4	22.2
College Gate	174.00	12	2.1	2.2	24.4
Creekside Park	180.00	8	1.4	1.5	25.9
Denali	190.00	9	1.6	1.7	27.5
Eagle River	200.00	6	1.1	1.1	28.6
Fairview	210.00	9	1.6	1.7	30.3
Fire Lake	215.00	7	1.3	1.3	31.6
Girdwood	220.00	4	.7	.7	32.3
Government Hill	230.00	3	.5	.6	32.8
Homestead	235.00	17	3.0	3.1	36.0
Huffman	237.00	12	2.1	2.2	38.2
Inlet View	240.00	4	.7	.7	38.9
Kasuun	242.00	5	.9	.9	39.8
Klatt	245.00	15	2.7	2.8	42.6
Kincaid	246.00	9	1.6	1.7	44.2
Lake Hood	248.00	9	1.6	1.7	45.9
Lake Otis	250.00	9	1.6	1.7	47.5
Mt. Spurr	257.00	7	1.3	1.3	48.8
Mountain View	260.00	16	2.9	2.9	51.7
Muldoon	270.00	4	.7	.7	52.5
Northern Lights ABC	290.00	6	1.1	1.1	53.6
Northwood	300.00	10	1.8	1.8	55.4
Nunaka Valley	310.00	9	1.6	1.7	57.1
Ocean View	315.00	6	1.1	1.1	58.2
O'Malley	320.00	15	2.7	2.8	60.9
Ptarmigan	328.00	12	2.1	2.2	63.1
Rabbit Creek	330.00	13	2.3	2.4	65.5

**School of Teacher (Continued)**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Ravenwood	335.00	7	1.3	1.3	66.8
Rogers Park	340.00	16	2.9	2.9	69.7
Russian Jack	345.00	3	.5	.6	70.3
Sand Lake	350.00	7	1.3	1.3	71.6
Scenic Park	360.00	8	1.4	1.5	73.0
Spring Hill	362.00	15	2.7	2.8	75.8
Susitna	364.00	12	2.1	2.2	78.0
Taku	365.00	12	2.1	2.2	80.2
Tudor	370.00	15	2.7	2.8	82.9
Turnagain	380.00	11	2.0	2.0	85.0
Tyson	384.00	14	2.5	2.6	87.5
Ursa Major	386.00	11	2.0	2.0	89.5
Ursa Minor	388.00	9	1.6	1.7	91.2
Williwaw	390.00	13	2.3	2.4	93.6
Willow Crest	400.00	17	3.0	3.1	96.7
Wonder Park	410.00	13	2.3	2.4	99.1
Wood	418.00	5	.9	.9	100.0
Total		559	100.0	100.0	

**Teacher's Grade**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Grade 1	1.00	81	14.5	14.6	14.6
Grade 2	2.00	90	16.1	16.2	30.8
Grade 3	3.00	77	13.8	13.8	44.6
Grade 4	4.00	91	16.3	16.4	61.0
Grade 5	5.00	64	11.4	11.5	72.5
Grade 6	6.00	89	15.9	16.0	88.5
Grade 8	8.00	1	.2	.2	88.7
Kindergarten	9.00	63	11.3	11.3	100.0
No Answer	.00	3	.5	Missing	
Total		559	100.0	100.0	

**Math Program Used**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EveryDay Math	1.00	470	84.1	85.1	85.1
Heath Math	2.00	56	10.0	10.1	95.3
Other	3.00	26	4.7	4.7	100.0
	.00	7	1.3	Missing	
Total		559	100.0	100.0	

**Most Commonly Used Supplementel Program**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Silver Burdett	1.00	130	23.3	25.9	25.9
ASD Materials	2.00	35	6.3	7.0	32.9
EDM Materials	3.00	178	31.8	35.5	68.3
Other	4.00	159	28.4	31.7	100.0
	.00	57	10.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	559	100.0	100.0	

**Years of School's Experience with Program**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
One	1.00	77	13.8	13.9	13.9
Two	2.00	241	43.1	43.7	57.6
Three	3.00	148	26.5	26.8	84.4
Four	4.00	55	9.8	10.0	94.4
Five	5.00	19	3.4	3.4	97.8
Six	6.00	12	2.1	2.2	100.0
	.00	7	1.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	559	100.0	100.0	

**I enjoy using this this program.**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	109	19.5	19.9	19.9
Agree	2.00	207	37.0	37.7	57.6
Disagree	3.00	131	23.4	23.9	81.4
Strongly Disagree	4.00	98	17.5	17.9	99.3
No Response	5.00	4	.7	.7	100.0
	.00	10	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	559	100.0	100.0	

**I have had training.in the use of our math program.**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	147	26.3	26.8	26.8
Agree	2.00	278	49.7	50.6	77.4
Disagree	3.00	79	14.1	14.4	91.8
Strongly Disagree	4.00	34	6.1	6.2	98.0
No Response	5.00	11	2.0	2.0	100.0
	.00	10	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	559	100.0	100.0	

**Program helps students understand math concepts.**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	126	22.5	23.2	23.2
Agree	2.00	214	38.3	39.3	62.5
Disagree	3.00	127	22.7	23.3	85.8
Strongly Disagree	4.00	74	13.2	13.6	99.4
No Response	5.00	3	.5	.6	100.0
	.	1	.2	Missing	
	.00	14	2.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		559	100.0	100.0	

**Program helps Students understand math facts and computation.**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	76	13.6	14.0	14.0
Agree	2.00	141	25.2	25.9	39.9
Disagree	3.00	172	30.8	31.6	71.5
Strongly Disagree	4.00	150	26.8	27.6	99.1
No Response	5.00	5	.9	.9	100.0
	.00	15	2.7	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		559	100.0	100.0	

**Students enjoy this program.**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	111	19.9	20.3	20.3
Agree	2.00	222	39.7	40.6	60.9
Disagree	3.00	140	25.0	25.6	86.5
Strongly Disagree	4.00	70	12.5	12.8	99.3
No Response	5.00	4	.7	.7	100.0
	.00	12	2.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		559	100.0	100.0	

**Program consistent with State and ASD standards.**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	130	23.3	24.2	24.2
Agree	2.00	240	42.9	44.6	68.8
Disagree	3.00	119	21.3	22.1	90.9
Strongly Disagree	4.00	39	7.0	7.2	98.1
No Response	5.00	10	1.8	1.9	100.0
	.00	21	3.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		559	100.0	100.0	

**Students are learning math using our program.**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	113	20.2	20.9	20.9
Agree	2.00	230	41.1	42.6	63.5
Disagree	3.00	129	23.1	23.9	87.4
Strongly Disagree	4.00	65	11.6	12.0	99.4
No Response	5.00	3	.5	.6	100.0
	.00	19	3.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		559	100.0	100.0	

**EDM Users Only - Use ASD computation supplemental materials with EDM.**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1.00	258	54.9	59.2	59.2
No	2.00	178	37.9	40.8	100.0
	.00	34	7.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		470	100.0	100.0	

## Appendix B

### Elementary Teacher Responses to

### Elementary Mathematics Survey

Spring 1999

#### Cross-tabulation of Responses by Specific Math Program

**"Supplemental Program Used" by Math Program**

Math Program				
Supplemental	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Silver Burdett	121	6	3	130
ASD Materials	34	0	1	35
EDM Materials	141	27	7	175
Other	135	10	11	156
No Valid Response	39	13	4	56
Total	470	56	26	552

**"Experience with Program" by Math Program**

Math Program				
Experience with Program	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
One Year	60	13	3	76
Two Years	194	34	11	239
Three Years	135	7	4	146
Four Years	50	2	2	54
Five Years	18	0	1	19
Six Years	7	0	4	11
No Valid Response	6	0	1	7
Total	470	56	26	552

**"I enjoy this program" by Math Program**

Math Program				
"Agreement" on "Enjoyment"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	80	11	17	108
Agree	176	24	6	206
Disagree	116	13	1	130
Strongly Disagree	88	6	1	95
No Valid Response	10	2	1	13
Total	470	56	26	552

**"I have had training" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Training"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	130	5	11	146
Agree	253	18	4	275
Disagree	52	22	5	79
Strongly Disagree	26	6	1	33
No Valid Response	9	5	5	19
Total	470	56	26	552

**"Students understand concepts" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Student Understand Concepts"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	98	11	16	125
Agree	178	27	6	211
Disagree	114	10	3	127
Strongly Disagree	66	6	0	72
No Valid Response	14	2	1	17
Total	470	56	26	552

**"Students understand facts and computation" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Student Understand Facts"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	43	15	17	75
Agree	114	20	5	139
Disagree	156	13	3	172
Strongly Disagree	139	8	0	147
No Valid Response	18	0	1	19
Total	470	56	26	552

**"Students enjoy this program" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Student Enjoyment"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	87	10	13	110
Agree	181	28	10	219
Disagree	123	13	2	138
Strongly Disagree	65	5	0	70
No Valid Response	14	0	1	15
Total	470	56	26	552

**"Program is consistent with standards" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Standards' Consistency"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	102	11	16	129
Agree	201	30	6	237
Disagree	105	9	3	117
Strongly Disagree	36	3	0	39
No Valid Response	26	3	1	30
Total	470	56	26	552

**"Students are learning" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Standards' Consistency"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	83	13	16	112
Agree	191	31	6	228
Disagree	116	8	3	127
Strongly Disagree	62	2	0	64
No Valid Response	18	2	1	21
Total	470	56	26	552

## Appendix C

### Elementary Principal Responses to

### Elementary Mathematics Survey

Spring 1999

#### Frequencies of Responses by Individual Question

##### School of Principal

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Airport Heights	110.00	1	2.6	2.7	2.7
Alpenglow	112.00	1	2.6	2.7	5.4
Baxter	115.00	1	2.6	2.7	8.1
Bear Valley	118.00	1	2.6	2.7	10.8
Birchwood ABC	120.00	1	2.6	2.7	13.5
Campbell	130.00	1	2.6	2.7	16.2
Chester Valley	140.00	1	2.6	2.7	18.9
Creekside Park	180.00	1	2.6	2.7	21.6
Eagle River	200.00	1	2.6	2.7	24.3
Fairview	210.00	1	2.6	2.7	27.0
Fire Lake	215.00	1	2.6	2.7	29.7
Homestead	235.00	1	2.6	2.7	32.4
Kasuun	242.00	1	2.6	2.7	35.1
Klatt	245.00	1	2.6	2.7	37.8
Kincaid	246.00	1	2.6	2.7	40.5
Lake Hood	248.00	1	2.6	2.7	43.2
Mt. Spurr	257.00	1	2.6	2.7	45.9
Mountain View	260.00	1	2.6	2.7	48.6
Northwood	300.00	1	2.6	2.7	51.4
Nunaka Valley	310.00	1	2.6	2.7	54.1
Ocean View	315.00	1	2.6	2.7	56.8
O'Malley	320.00	1	2.6	2.7	59.5
Ptarmigan	328.00	1	2.6	2.7	62.2
Ravenwood	335.00	1	2.6	2.7	64.9
Rogers Park	340.00	1	2.6	2.7	67.6
Russian Jack	345.00	1	2.6	2.7	70.3
Sand Lake	350.00	1	2.6	2.7	73.0
Spring Hill	362.00	1	2.6	2.7	75.7
Susitna	364.00	1	2.6	2.7	78.4
Taku	365.00	1	2.6	2.7	81.1
Tudor	370.00	1	2.6	2.7	83.8
Turnagain	380.00	1	2.6	2.7	86.5
Tyson	384.00	1	2.6	2.7	89.2
Ursa Major	386.00	1	2.6	2.7	91.9
Ursa Minor	388.00	1	2.6	2.7	94.6
Willow Crest	400.00	1	2.6	2.7	97.3
Wood	418.00	1	2.6	2.7	100.0
	.00	1	2.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	38	100.0	100.0	

**Math Program Used by School**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EDM	1.00	33	86.8	86.8	86.8
Heath	2.00	3	7.9	7.9	94.7
S.Foresman	3.00	1	2.6	2.6	97.4
Saxon	4.00	1	2.6	2.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	38	100.0	100.0	

**Common Supplemental Materials**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Silver	1.00	7	18.4	18.9	18.9
ASD	2.00	14	36.8	37.8	56.8
EDM	3.00	7	18.4	18.9	75.7
Other/Owm	4.00	9	23.7	24.3	100.0
	.00	1	2.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	38	100.0	100.0	

**Years of School's Experience with Math Program**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
One	1.00	1	2.6	2.8	2.8
Two	2.00	19	50.0	52.8	55.6
Three	3.00	12	31.6	33.3	88.9
Four	4.00	3	7.9	8.3	97.2
Six	6.00	1	2.6	2.8	100.0
N/A	.00	2	5.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	38	100.0	100.0	

**High Quality Math Program**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	11	28.9	30.6	30.6
Agree	2.00	20	52.6	55.6	86.1
Disagree	3.00	5	13.2	13.9	100.0
No Response	.00	2	5.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	38	100.0	100.0	

**Have Had Training in Program**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	10	26.3	26.3	26.3
Agree	2.00	19	50.0	50.0	76.3
Disagree	3.00	3	7.9	7.9	84.2
Strongly Disagree	4.00	3	7.9	7.9	92.1
N/A	5.00	3	7.9	7.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	38	100.0	100.0	

**Program helps Students Learn Math Concepts**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	17	44.7	45.9	45.9
Agree	2.00	20	52.6	54.1	100.0
No Response	.00	1	2.6	Missing	
		-----	-----		
Total		38	100.0	100.0	

**Program helps Students Learn Basic Math Facts**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	7	18.4	18.9	18.9
Agree	2.00	16	42.1	43.2	62.2
Disagree	3.00	10	26.3	27.0	89.2
Strongly Disagree	4.00	3	7.9	8.1	97.3
N/A	5.00	1	2.6	2.7	100.0
No Response	.00	1	2.6	Missing	
		-----	-----		
Total		38	100.0	100.0	

**Teachers enjoy using program**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	4	10.5	10.8	10.8
Agree	2.00	22	57.9	59.5	70.3
Disagree	3.00	8	21.1	21.6	91.9
Strongly Disagree	4.00	3	7.9	8.1	100.0
No Response	.00	1	2.6	Missing	
		-----	-----		
Total		38	100.0	100.0	

**Teachers need additional training**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	6	15.8	16.2	16.2
Agree	2.00	18	47.4	48.6	64.9
Disagree	3.00	10	26.3	27.0	91.9
Strongly Disagree	4.00	1	2.6	2.7	94.6
N/A	5.00	2	5.3	5.4	100.0
No Response	.00	1	2.6	Missing	
		-----	-----		
Total		38	100.0	100.0	

**Program consistent with State/District Standards**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	14	36.8	37.8	37.8
Agree	2.00	19	50.0	51.4	89.2
Disagree	3.00	4	10.5	10.8	100.0
No Response	.00	1	2.6	Missing	
		-----	-----		
Total		38	100.0	100.0	

**Students are learning with our Math program**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	11	28.9	30.6	30.6
Agree	2.00	23	60.5	63.9	94.4
Disagree	3.00	2	5.3	5.6	100.0
No Response	.00	2	5.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		38	100.0	100.0	

**EDM Schools Only - Use District supplemental computation materials.**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1.00	27	81.8	90.0	90.0
NO	2.00	3	9.1	10.0	100.0
NO ANS.	.00	3	9.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		33	100.0	100.0	

## Appendix D

### Elementary Principal Responses to

### Elementary Mathematics Survey

Spring 1999

#### Cross-tabulation of Responses by Specific Math Program

##### "Supplemental Program Used" by Math Program

	Math Program			
Supplemental	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Silver Burdett	7	0	0	7
ASD Materials	12	1	1	14
EDM Materials	7	0	0	7
Other	6	2	1	9
No Valid Response	1	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>38</b>

##### "Experience with Program" by Math Program

	Math Program			
Experience with Program	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
One Year	1	0	0	1
Two Years	17	1	1	19
Three Years	9	2	1	12
Four Years	3	0	0	3
Five Years	0	0	0	0
Six Years	1	0	0	1
No Valid Response	2	0	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>38</b>

##### "Quality Math Program" by Math Program

	Math Program			
"Agreement" on "Quality"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	10	1	0	11
Agree	16	2	2	20
Disagree	5	0	0	5
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0
No Valid Response	2	0	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>38</b>

**"Had Training in Program" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Training"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	10	0	0	10
Agree	17	0	2	19
Disagree	1	2	0	3
Strongly Disagree	2	1	0	3
No Valid Response	3	0	0	3
Total	33	3	2	38

**"Program Helps with Concepts" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Concepts"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	17	0	0	17
Agree	15	3	2	20
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0
No Valid Response	1	0	0	1
Total	33	3	2	38

**"Program Helps with Facts" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Facts"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	6	0	1	7
Agree	12	3	1	16
Disagree	10	0	0	10
Strongly Disagree	3	0	0	3
No Valid Response	2	0	0	2
Total	33	3	2	38

**"Teachers Enjoy Using Program" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Teacher Enjoyment"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	4	0	0	4
Agree	18	3	1	22
Disagree	7	0	1	8
Strongly Disagree	3	0	0	3
No Valid Response	1	0	0	1
Total	33	3	2	38

**"Teachers Need Additional Training" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Teachers Need Training"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	6	0	0	6
Agree	17	0	1	18
Disagree	6	3	1	10
Strongly Disagree	1	0	0	1
No Valid Response	3	0	0	3
Total	33	3	2	38

**"Program Consistent with Standards" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Standards' Consistency"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	14	0	0	14
Agree	14	3	2	19
Disagree	4	0	0	4
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0
No Valid Response	1	0	0	1
Total	33	3	2	38

**"Students Are Learning" by Math Program**

Math Program

"Agreement" on "Student Learning"	Everyday Math	Heath Math	Other	Total
Strongly Agree	10	1	0	11
Agree	19	2	2	23
Disagree	2	0	0	2
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	0
No Valid Response	2	0	0	2
Total	33	3	2	38

**Appendix E**  
**Middle School Teacher Responses to**  
**Elementary Mathematics Survey**  
**Spring 1999**

**Frequencies of Responses by Individual Question**

**School of Teacher**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Central Middle School	700.00	5	15.6	15.6	15.6
Clark Middle School	710.00	6	18.8	18.8	34.4
Gruening Middle School	730.00	1	3.1	3.1	37.5
Mears Middle School	750.00	5	15.6	15.6	53.1
Mirror Lake Middle School	755.00	4	12.5	12.5	65.6
Romig Middle School	760.00	1	3.1	3.1	68.8
Wendler Middle School	770.00	7	21.9	21.9	90.6
Goldenview Middle School	780.00	3	9.4	9.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

**Grade**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Grade 6	6.00	3	9.4	9.4	9.4
Grade 7	7.00	16	50.0	50.0	59.4
Grade 8	8.00	13	40.6	40.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

**Years of Teaching Experience**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
One	1.00	3	9.4	9.4	9.4
Two	2.00	4	12.5	12.5	21.9
Three	3.00	7	21.9	21.9	43.8
Four	4.00	2	6.3	6.3	50.0
Five	5.00	2	6.3	6.3	56.3
Six	6.00	14	43.8	43.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

**Are you familiar with Grade 6 Program & Skills?**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1.00	24	75.0	80.0	80.0
No	2.00	6	18.8	20.0	100.0
No response	.00	2	6.3	Missing	
		-----	-----		
Total		32	100.0	100.0	

**Do students have conceptual understanding needed for Math 7?**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Agree	2.00	11	34.4	39.3	39.3
Disagree	3.00	13	40.6	46.4	85.7
Strongly Disagree	4.00	4	12.5	14.3	100.0
No Answer	.00	1	3.1	Missing	
No Response	5.00	3	9.4	Missing	
		-----	-----		
Total		32	100.0	100.0	

**Do students have conceptual understanding needed for Pre-Algebra?**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	1	3.1	3.4	3.4
Agree	2.00	13	40.6	44.8	48.3
Disagree	3.00	10	31.3	34.5	82.8
Strongly Disagree	4.00	5	15.6	17.2	100.0
No Response	5.00	3	9.4	Missing	
		-----	-----		
Total		32	100.0	100.0	

**Do students have conceptual understanding needed for Algebra?**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Agree	2.00	9	28.1	40.9	40.9
Disagree	3.00	9	28.1	40.9	81.8
Strongly Disagree	4.00	4	12.5	18.2	100.0
No Answer	.00	1	3.1	Missing	
No Response	5.00	9	28.1	Missing	
		-----	-----		
Total		32	100.0	100.0	

**Do students have computational skills needed for Math 7?**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Agree	2.00	5	15.6	18.5	18.5
Disagree	3.00	8	25.0	29.6	48.1
Strongly Disagree	4.00	14	43.8	51.9	100.0
No Answer	.00	2	6.3	Missing	
No Response	5.00	3	9.4	Missing	
		-----	-----		
Total		32	100.0	100.0	

**Do students have computational skills needed for Pre-Algebra?**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Agree	2.00	9	28.1	32.1	32.1
Disagree	3.00	11	34.4	39.3	71.4
Strongly Disagree	4.00	8	25.0	28.6	100.0
No Answer	.00	1	3.1	Missing	
No Response	5.00	3	9.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		32	100.0	100.0	

**Do students have computational skills needed for Algebra?**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Agree	2.00	7	21.9	33.3	33.3
Disagree	3.00	8	25.0	38.1	71.4
Strongly Disagree	4.00	6	18.8	28.6	100.0
No Answer	.00	1	3.1	Missing	
No Response	5.00	10	31.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		32	100.0	100.0	

**Do we need more emphasis on computation than on concepts?**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Agree	1.00	3	9.4	13.6	13.6
Agree	2.00	9	28.1	40.9	54.5
Disagree	3.00	6	18.8	27.3	81.8
Strongly Disagree	4.00	4	12.5	18.2	100.0
No Answer	.00	9	28.1	Missing	
No Response	5.00	1	3.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		32	100.0	100.0	

Appendix F  
Elementary Teacher Responses to  
Elementary Mathematics Survey  
Spring 1999  
Open Ended Responses

“What would you like me to consider when I think about our current math program and how it is working?”

**Comments from teachers of Everyday Math.**

- I love this program - it is a new way of thinking. The students are learning for CAT tests (big difference in the scores of math concepts and math computation) and computation skills this program is greatly lacking!! Plus, I want my own supplies - sharing materials between 3 classes is terrible.
- We have had great success. It does need computational supplementation.
- Keep money support for journals 1,2 and activity books. Our entire school needs carts for the manipulative we have.
- Achieving an effective means to reach the slower math students who find this math series very difficult.
- I think Everyday Math is an excellent program at the K level.
- This program takes an extreme amount of time. It moves through the lessons at a very fast pace.
- I think students in fourth grade still need lots of time with manipulative (beyond card games). I would like a program that addressed and taught those concepts and skills covered in standardized tests since parents and the community look to those scores as a way to judge math ability.
- I think that some teachers are not willing to put in the time it takes to use a new program. At first glance manuals are not user friendly, but now I have no problem. I did conduct a class for new-to-grade level this year and I wish someone had done that for me at the beginning - but I'm, now self-taught. I did not use ASD computation materials because I had my own.
- Not enough practice at each conceptual level especially computation.
- BE REAL! This program should have about 30% removed!! Teachers should know they need supplement with 30-40% computation. It does not feel successful to try and teach this very complicated program with little support.
- Admit that EDM was a total bungle. Stop using it before too much damage is done and adopt a text geared to traditional math. Use EDM as a supplemental text.

- I need more training. This program is great for the top kids, but it moves too fast and has too many teaching points in each lesson for the lower students.
- It spirals too fast for some students - they need more repetition. We need more support materials. We need to look at 2 digit addition and subtraction in 1st and 2nd grade.
- I believe it should be mandatory to use supplemental computation materials. There are holes in the students knowledge. Assessment should be more frequent and should assess what has been taught.
- The time (teacher time) spent to implement this program. Also our copy count issue.
- Cost of materials. It is not "Parent friendly" - no guidance for parents to help at home. Jump all over in presentation of concepts.
- I do like the fact that this program does make the kids think and apply the skills. However, the approach of so many different concepts in one lesson becomes very overwhelming to students - and confusing! The lack of examples/samples to practice is a major concern.
- The program is good for the top quarter of math skilled students. The average or below average skilled kids are confused. Lots of supplemental is needed. The EM teacher guide does not give adequate direction and guidance.
- Everyday math takes time to learn how much to teach it, and for students and parents to become comfortable with it. The concepts taught, the way they are taught and the connections to real life are magnificent. It is an excellent program when used consistently and correctly.
- Everyday Math has provided a great framework for concept development. As the program is designed to build skills upon skills it is essential to use it in all grade levels.
- One third (or less actually) of my class does well to great, one third can understand with extra work and supplemental materials, one third need to be in a different math program.
- It does not give enough practice to really learn any "one" concept. It assumes students already know how to do most of the concepts, like in the math boxes. I do like how it gives the high performance math kids challenges, but it is not teaching basic math concepts in any unit.
- When beginning a new math program(or any new program) such as EDM there must be more teacher training. I feel most ASD teachers feel uncomfortable with EDM because they don't understand it themselves. I would also like to see programs begin when the kid begins 5-6th grade. EDM without prior exposure is hard.
- I very much like it for kindergarten. I know upper level grades have more concerns about it. If you end up making some kind of change can you consider leaving it for primary and using something else at intermediate?
- My bilingual students(of which 1/5 of my class is) really struggle with it because it is so language oriented. Additionally, my students have not been spiraled through the program since kindergarten so they all struggle because of the huge difference in how they are expected to learn. I am really bothered by having fifth graders who don't know their times tables - It makes it almost impossible to do fractions, decimals, and percents.
- I LOVE IT!!! PLEASE don't change till we give it a chance. Feel free to contact me - Stephanie Bushnell

- I came from Ketchikan where I taught 3rd grade math using “Heath Mathematics” . . . a very traditional program. When I came to ASD to teach 3rd grade I immediately noticed a difference in math achievement. My 3rd grade students as compared to my 3rd graders in Ketchikan, were functioning at a significantly higher level in math computation and problem solving. I attribute this to the Everyday Math program which has been used at Williwaw for over 4 years. I would suggest continued teacher support/in servicing in EDM to maximize the programs potential.
- For Everyday Math to be successful, everyone should be using it (across District) to support spiral model. EM is more challenging for students without preschool experience or family support. It is more frustrating to teach to catch kids up (try to) or fill in their gaps. EM is an excellent resource and really supports math sense and achievement.
- A more comprehensive supplemental/program providing facts and computation would help.
- I think it is a good program only if it is being taught in all classrooms.
- We need a computation program.
- The Everyday Math should have been brought in one year at a time (K, K-1, K-2, etc.) The whole program is based on prior experience. Also, for a school like Willow Crest with low achieving students and parents, this program is too difficult and advanced - concept wise.
- We need to supplement EDM with basic facts. Some of the material seems too hard for the students as they have not had a lot of prior experience with the program. We spend a lot of time prepping the kids for the lessons. We also stay on the lessons longer because so many of the students need additional practice.
- More training - especially for multi age teachers. Concrete computation supplement for every grade level.
- Schools with a transient population (especially on military installation) lose much of the benefits of the Everyday Math program because of students coming and going. Even the movement of students within the district are hampered by changing schools where different programs are taught because of the incompatibility. Everyday Math is very time consuming. This does not allow for a balance in time spent on Language Arts which is just as, even more important in the primary grades. The student texts (journals) are strictly “Everyday Math” language. Students must be directly taught the language (not the math) in order to complete journal pages, and completely understand the “jargon” before given pages as “homework”. (Because parents do not know what their child is supposed to do either because there is no explanation/examples provided for them to “help their child” If allowed to answer honestly, I believe a majority of teachers (with Everyday Math in the building) use the binder of Blackline Masters to reinforce, practice, and provide “homework” of math skills. These are from programs that use an actual student text; why are the “old blackline masters” acceptable to use, but their updated math programs and texts are not? Students enjoy moving on to working problem from a “student text book”. I speak from a third grade teachers’ perspective, where in the past, third grade was the “magical” year that students were given and taught math using a hard cover student math book. It was always motivating to students, as proof by their enthusiasm when given as assignment in text. Without additional training, EDM teacher material/text does not provide teachers sufficient - easy to find - explanation/strategies to present/teach new concepts and EDM “lingo” which is very time consuming for many of the lessons. (A two-day summer academy course for teachers using EDM has been canceled.) The manipulative with EDM are great to help students have a “hands-on” experience to learning/understanding math facts and computation, these are not available every time the student must compute/use math facts. Drill and practice are still best to commit to memory.

- Too many concepts are introduced too quickly without the opportunity to develop an understanding of the concepts.
- The math standards - national and state standards, children need to learn to think critically and be able to problem solve - not just do drill and practice worksheets.
- How can multi-age classrooms manage EDM - planning time? Games are integral part of program - important because it is a time kids can talk to each other about math. How can you be sure they are being used? CAT testing does not address problem solving, cooperative learning. Because of cost of consumables - are students getting their journals?
- In reference to question #4 (helps students understand math facts and computation) I think that the EDM program needs supplemental material to help students practice their math facts. In other words more skill and drill sheets.
- Consider the fact that not all students are receiving the services of EDM because teachers are not teaching it. This makes it extremely difficult for 6th grade.
- It is a very strong program. However, the math lessons take about 2-3 days each depending on the strength of the students and the activities that are incorporated into those lessons. Expecting that both journals are going to be covered is unrealistic. The EDM program helps to develop student understanding of math concepts rather than simply going through algorithms.
- We need to concentrate on basic skill mastery before we move on to understanding more involved concepts. Conceptual learning would also be beneficial. EDM pushes students ahead when they are not ready to go on.
- EDM - reading level is too high. There is not enough computation practice nor is there enough presentation of problem-solving strategies (ex. word problems).
- EDM seems to push many concepts that were taught at junior high on to elementary students. The average student struggles. Low achieving students are lost. Those children who have moved into abstract reasoning do better and seem to enjoy the challenge but they are only one third to one quarter of the whole group. EDM is difficult for subs to pick up and teach. Parents have difficulty assisting their children - especially if they have been absent. Fifth graders need more hands on work with fractions and decimals before they can be successful with the sixth grade EDM. Thank you for asking for my input. In the past when I expressed concerns I was given little credence.
- Provide new to level training.
- My students have done well with math concepts only because I supplemented my program. If I had stuck to EDM as written - the progress would not have been as great. The program introduces many concepts quickly then moves on to something else.
- EDM has good concepts, but it doesn't cover computation skills and it is frustrating for the students to get fractions one day and then something else the next day. I would like to make units out of all the same kind of lessons and teach them over a block of time so the students master the concepts and skills. Thanks for asking how we fell!
- It does not allow for enough practice for the students - their basic fact knowledge is not in mastery like it should be due to less drill practice.
- Students need practice to master a skill. Some (many) cannot deal with the random - abstract sense of EDM. It confuses them and they seem to recall nothing.

- It is too difficult for my students. I have to supplement a lot. The way the program spirals doesn't give enough time for kids to feel successful on each skill before the next is introduced.
- That it is based upon the assumption that students have the skills needed to use a higher level of learning which they do not have! That math boxes can be used as a refresher which is not the case. Each set of math boxes comprises a host of individual time consuming lessons.
- I think it is important that whatever the math adoption is by the district, everyone in the building needs to teach it.
- I have taught both the third and fourth grade programs. I don't feel the program spends enough time developing the concepts in the third grade. There aren't enough manipulative activities built into the program. It seems that my better math students are doing OK but my students that are challenged have continued to be challenged.
- It needs to be supplemented for drills and additional practice.
- It is very hard to grade students. Almost everything needs to be done together. Not enough time is spent in one area. It seems like you touch on it and then move on and then come back to it weeks later and expect the students to remember. I spend more time in areas, but don't cover it all. Math boxes have to be cut up to be used.
- Stick with this program. Going "back to basics" or "drill and kill" does not serve our students well. Support it!
- I enjoyed using Mathland . . . our school was a pilot program. I would like it considered as an alternative to EM.
- Add extra manipulatives in the purchase package.
- I see my young students feeling more confident with larger numbers, learning and using patterns in numeration than ever before. I think they will understand higher level concepts easier when in intermediate grades. There is a need for conscious, skill-based lessons at times. Like reading, a teacher must have a variety of ways to teach and must them judiciously. Don't change the program. I predict we will see a positive uprising in scores in the next 3 years.
- The spiral learning technique involved in EDM is not conducive to the backgrounds of military students. These students do not benefit from being in a school district long enough to master the "hit and miss" concepts.
- I would like you to consider the fact that students need a strong math foundation before they can begin to understand a lot of the concepts presented in EDM. The activities aren't always developmentally appropriate for the students I teach either.
- We need more funding for copies. I am unable to send math homework home because I do not have enough copies available.
- More teachers need more training in its use. Difficult to get through entire program in one year - make district decision on what is crucial to cover. Copy machine allotment does not cover home links, parent letters and drill/practice worksheets.

- It is very difficult to finish the entire program in one year. I have done math in my class 4-5 days a week for 1 hour and 20 minutes each day and still have 1 unit in 1st and 2 units in 2nd not done. This need to be addressed by the district.
- Lack of computation skills. Turn over of students and transience effects continuity of program.
- How can we eliminate combination classes so the teachers can give direct instruction to all students in a reasonable amount of time? Combination classes do not allow for that in terms of daily schedule. This program does require direct instruction. I can't give both grades adequate time. You missed some vital questions.
- Using this program in multi-age classrooms or combination classes has been difficult.
- We are finally challenging our highest 1st graders. Yea, it's a lot of work but it is a fantastic program when implemented correctly!
- A program with more computation. A program that masters an area before you go onto some other topic. A program that masters the basics (add, subtract, multiply and divide).
- Low kids tend to fall further and further behind; this program does not allow for much remedial teaching. Very low kids are generally unsuccessful.
- This program is good for high achieving students and for teachers who are experienced and don't have to follow the format of the teacher's manual. In 21 years of teaching, this program is the worst of "user friendly" material I've seen! The program is too intense and very unorganized in presentation.
- That it can't be judged until a student that begins in K and follows the program for at least 4 years - initially it is difficult, but as kids and teachers spiral and learn the vocabulary it is easier. It is difficult for parents to know what is going on the homework is not always understood by them.
- The spiral (re-visitation of skills) rather than mastery.
- Concerns about time issues in using EDM in combination classes.
- It confuses the students - too much, too soon. Too much confusion - Too many options.
- We need a supplemental material that would introduce each individual skill before using the everyday lessons. At the moment there are too many skills grouped together.
- This program is an absolute failure, I have never had classes so low in math before these last two and a half years. If we must continue using this inadequate program, please consider bumping all math levels ahead one year (i.e. first grade uses K program, second used first grade program . . .) When this program is abandoned and we adopt one that works try to adopt one that is more user friendly.
- Time to plan/get familiar with material when changing grade levels - support for multi-age classrooms - funds to replace materials i.e. compasses etc. that wear out.
- EDM is too fast paced for many students. As a Special Ed teacher I am supposed to tie my students goals and objectives into their curriculum, but this is very difficult to do with EDM. I am using 1st grad journals to teach 2nd grade skills - or I am modifying my second grade materials - but my students are still struggling with basic computation. Math boxes allow for modification, but only a few teachers use them this way. Also, parents have a difficult time understanding some of the "methods" and therefore can't help with homework.

- This is very difficult for a bilingual population. The lower 25%ile have great difficulty with this program. Very difficult to address new skills daily . . . no time for reinforcement. This is a teacher centered not student centered curriculum.
- I have seen a major drop in students' computation skills and understanding of concepts since using this program. Our resource program has seen an increase in the number of students being referred for math. We need a program which builds on students' prior knowledge not one that jumps around and never gets mastery on any concept.
- A different math program that has repetition in it and not a program that only hits a concept and never see again for twenty more lessons.
- Students are not getting it - they never stay with one concept till mastery!! We've never had so many referrals for special Ed in the area of math before!! Bring back Houghton-Mifflin.
- Please consider all children and their reading abilities. Most of my students cannot read well enough to be successful with EDM. This program also assumes that students already have the basic skills needed to succeed with program. Most don't have the skills needed.
- That there are much nicer math programs that are much more learner friendly. EDM is a frustrating program for my first graders!
- More computational practice especially for multiplication.
- The EDM requires a different way of thinking about math instruction that teachers haven't been well prepared for. If students coming out prepared its because teachers were not prepared.
- I believe that EDM is better suited to IA or Gifted students and that the regular classes are totally lost with it. It does not fit the ASD math standards.
- Making sure the supplemental materials are available to all.
- Starting the program at all grade levels in view of students' lack of background with EDM was not a great idea. I played catch-up this year by using about half supplementary materials. The students like EDM, but it didn't produce high CAT scores without lots of other materials.
- For many students EDM does not provide enough reinforcement/repetition, despite its "spiral model." The students who enjoy EDM are my brightest, most abstract thinkers. My lower, more concrete students struggle.
- About changing back to a system which teaches basics and computation.
- I do not believe this (EDM) program works very well with learning disabled children. It is difficult to alter the material to a level they understand. I've had many more math resource referrals while using EDM than I had while using Math Their Way.
- Parents need to be educated better about the program's philosophy. Parents need more resources to help their children when their child is having difficulty.
- Many errors in Teachers Edition. Reading level too difficult for some students. Questions are often confusing or misleading.
- The kids don't have the prior knowledge or background that the program assumes they have.

- Much of the material in journals need to done on an overhead and not much independent work.
- Organization of the material, supplements, and mastery at every level. Enough of the “spiral effect.” Kids are starting to get discouraged.
- For schools heading into it, the intermediate grades really need to do a lot of supplemental work. As this program is based on a spiral curriculum, many concepts are “assumed” at the higher grades. Teachers need to be aware of this.
- I feel the program is very difficult for below-average children. I had many students unable to keep up with the program.
- Prior knowledge. The EDM should have started in Kindergarten and progress. Most grades were just thrown into the program and the kids had to sink or swim to catch up.
- When taught throughout the whole school this is an excellent program. Materials need to be purchased.
- More training for teachers who haven’t been trained. Actually have a math person teach the program the way it should be taught so the classroom teacher can see by example.
- Money in the budget for materials, journals.
- Does this program provide opportunity for students to learn math according to district, state, national standards? (Yes!) . . . to develop higher level thinking skills? (Yes!) . . . to develop a positive attitude towards math? (Yes!) You may also look at the reasons some people object to EDM and consider the validity of those objections. I believe you will find that objections are not based on sound educational principles. The argument that EDM is not developmentally appropriate is not valid. Just watch K-1 enjoying it!
- Consider that it is the first program these children have used that allows them to think mathematically rather than crunch numbers in a meaningless way. Consider that children are enjoying, exploring, and experiencing math.
- About 1/3 of my fourth graders are working in 3rd grade journals. The 4th grade materials proved to be too difficult. I attribute this to the 1/3 being new to the district.
- The high level of transience at schools like those on base. Kids coming without the EDM background in the early years struggle with the difficult material.
- Organization of the journal pages is extremely difficult for my students to follow - we do everything together on overheads.
- I agree with the concepts of the program - it is a great improvement on former teaching practices because of both the concrete manipulatives and the math theory, BUT there is not enough material or time provided for mastery of computational skills which are the basis of standardized testing.
- For students who have good number sense, good computational skills, this is an excellent program. For those who do not or for those who move around a lot, this is a terrible program.
- Mastery, mastery, mastery. There is no practice time and no mastery in this program - too many unconnected math boxes.

- EDM works wonderfully for the “haves”, and is a disaster for the “have nots.” The program leaves parents in the lurch.
- Please consider the fact that this program is totally inappropriate to meeting the needs of Special Ed students.
- This program does not teach the skills to a point that a student retains the skill. The program introduces a concept once then moves on and then expects the student to remember the concept weeks later.
- EDM is great for advanced math students! EDM jumps around a lot and the lower level students get frustrated and don't master what is taught.
- Follow through. More time and lessons on each lesson. Give more basic skills.
- This program “spirals” too fast and does not spend enough time teaching the skill. There is no pattern. Students who have a weakness in language, bilingual or Special Ed. are sabotaged for learning math to this program is not easy to adapt to other learners. I depend on supplemental materials.
- In kindergarten and first grade the expectations are too high and there is not enough repetition - especially for students with learning disabilities.
- It does not meet the needs of my students. Further, it does not promote self-confidence in math because student never get enough practice to feel they master anything. The old Silver Burdett books are in short supply and falling apart. I can't imagine trying to use them 8 more years. Additionally, limiting my copies further ties my hands. I'd rather teach math and do it well but the District isn't giving me the tools I need.
- This program is frustrating for my students. There is not enough drill and practice on a specific area so that they feel comfortable with it.
- Consider Saxon math or any other math which does not restate concepts so quickly and provides consistent, practical pencil and paper computation directly related to the concept being taught.
- The spiral concept is a good one, however there are other programs that will teach kids more. Too much EDM has to be done together. I believe in reinforcing - not teaching a new concept here and there “they'll get it eventually??” How did Northwood get to adopt a program we didn't even get a choice of?? The ASD should have looked at Saxon more closely - good program!
- If we are giving standardized tests and achievement tests for graduation we need to make certain the series covers the areas tested. EDM gives students “experiences” but they don't learn enough (3rd) to apply it because of the lack of drill/practice.
- See how well these students are doing when they go to up to the Middle School.
- Each year that we use it, it works better as the spiral builds. The problem was starting it in all grades without progression from KG.
- This program is fine for students with good basic skills and good reading abilities. Lower students struggle and often miss major concepts . My students prefer material I prepare and get from other programs.

- Find something that work with math computations and make sure ALL schools have all manipulatives when they adopt the program.
- I wouldn't use the word ENJOY. This program, which is daily presenting new ideas, frustrates my students. However, when they grasp a new idea, they feel GREAT, because it was such a hurdle. Please keep in mind that parents feel frustrated and helpless, too.
- Thank you so very much for asking my opinion. This is the first time I remember being surveyed. I really appreciate it. There are several aspects of EDM that can easily cause math anxiety. Imagine yourself as a your student. Contrary to the advice from math anxiety researchers we are presenting abstract concepts to students before they are developmentally ready for them. We are rushing along not allowing any mastery of any concept. This causes anxiety, anger and avoidance. Mr. Christal, I psyche myself up EveryDay so I can have a positive attitude and balance my students groans during EDM. Please understand we teachers know there is more to math than computation, but with EDM I must do something every work day I don't believe. I do 2 maths a day. Morning with silver Burdett. PMs with EDM. I feel very stressed over this because I can see it causing math anxiety. One of my sources of pressure is intermediate teachers. They expect my graduates to have covered most of EDM book. Therefore I rush the poor kids along. My morale on math is rock bottom low. It used to be my favorite thing to teach. Complaints re. EDM: 1) not appropriate for developmental level of students. 2) Not user friendly for teacher. For example many books must be used by teachers. 3) No satisfaction of mastery (for child or adult). 4) disorganized. 5) Assumes knowledge not known. I am very unhappy. I must teach double math to keep parents happy (who want more computation). I am worn out!!
- It is a little difficult for kids. I hope as they get used to the EDM program they will get better at it.
- There is too much to cover in one year, with Math box worksheets, home link pages, and journals I and II and an activity book.
- There are many multi age classrooms in ASD. EDM is very difficult to teach in multi age.
- I am not sure what the problem is. Students don't seem to have skills they need to get through the program. It seems I am always asking them to do things that are very difficult for many students. If I spend time working them through it then I don't finish the journals. Actually I do enjoy the program, but it is frustrating to my students. They don't seem to have the skills they need to do the independent work.
- Why is it that the only training I get I had to pay for myself? This program is incomplete and if they haven't had it all along they are lost.
- Concepts move to fast (even though it is a spiral effect) for the students to grasp and retain before they move on.
- There are many areas that are not given enough time and attention, such as time and money. It is impossible to get through all of the scheduled curriculum. the nature of EDM may not meet the needs of all Special Ed. students.
- The students are able to do math on their own without a lot of spoon fed answers. Computation practice. They need more practice with concepts. EDM journals are to short of pages and very teacher directed.
- I feel that this program is too difficult for our students. It is difficult to teach 3-4 lessons a week and feel that the students have an adequate understanding of the objectives. My students feel a lot of frustration and anxiety with the math lessons - I feel that they need to experience more successful

learning experiences than what they are having. Children need to feel good about their math skills and I feel EDM is too high of expectations for them meet at their grade level.

- Systematic expectations district-wide. Students perform at different levels, per school, however it would be good to have benchmark that is reasonable for low and high achieving schools.
- Give it at least 5 years. Consider teachers mentoring others. Look at how students are performing before changing.
- It should've been phased in - it's too big of a leap for kids to go from traditional textbook to EDM. But since it wasn't phased in, leave it in place long enough for me to get students in 5th/6th grade that had EDM from kindergarten on.
- The EDM program requires quite a bit of copying and is hard to implement when grade levels before you don't teach it. Way too much reading for any child with a reading disability.
- Some learners are not suited for the EDM approach. Parents are skeptical - unsure of the EDM direction/reliability. Multi age classrooms/students suffer under this math - as the district math specialist has asked me to teach to each grade level. This is too much!! Cannot do an adequate job teaching with two overloaded math curriculums. Kids Loose.
- Give the program time to work. Students that come up with EDM will have superior skills. Students that have not come up through the EDM program are weaker in skill development.
- I think the EDM program is weak in teaching basic computation; fractions and decimals. Having a supplementary based math text is essential to fill the gaps. There is no way to cover all of the material in a year based upon the daily time allocated for math.
- How many children are successful with this program compared with other programs?
- The BIG picture
- Business community wants THINKERS and PROBLEM SOLVERS for future employees. Math concepts has a higher educational value - Parents should take responsibility for memorizing facts and support extra drill. The concepts stand should extend into middle school.
- It makes the children think. They are more able to problem solve now.
- Smaller class sizes
- Manageable class sizes in order to give more quality time for individual attention and explorations.
- Give this program a few years . It takes over exposure of math concepts to be fully understood.
- This is an excellent program for gifted students. It does not address the needs of the average and low students. In order to cover the entire program for a year one would have to teach only math all day. There is not enough practice to reinforce learning and develop understanding. Thus, much supplementing needs to be done.
- This program is wonderful for the gifted and high students in the class. For the average student and low students they struggle a lot. The concepts do not spiral fast enough in this program for students to achieve mastery.
- Many resource kids have a really tough time with this program.

- I much prefer scope and sequence goals and freedom to reach them in a variety of ways. I don't like adopting one resource. Having common goals and loads of staff development opportunities/ideas about fun activities to reach them is preferable.
- A longer amount of time needs to be spent on new concepts. Jumping around so much makes the students feel overwhelmed and frustrated.
- By the last quarter of 6th grade some kids are not ready for the EDM algebra units - I've had to put 5 in a separate review group.
- EDM is good for some majorities, but not good for others. It all depends on the group you get. I would like to see a more structured program the emphasis more conceptual/but mandatory facts learning. All math can be fun if taught that way. EDM discourages a lot of kids.
- It's very difficult for all the top students. I feel concepts are more fully understood with Math Their Way methods.
- I have mixed feelings about EDM. My students have more math concepts than I would expect, but I spend over 1 hour each day and parents have to teach at home. Teach not just reinforce.
- The program does have good concepts. I disagree with how it frustrates students by presenting many concepts at one time! The program as is needs to add more computation practice in a consistent manner.
- Making sure ALL teachers have all of the EDM pieces - Resource book, activity books, journal II as well as Journal I and the whole manipulative kit as well as calculators. I don't think it is reasonable that we should share. It's just too hard planning. I'm not willing to dig in another teacher's room when I am here late at night working. I do the EDM program as much as I am able with the above restrictions and don't feel the program can be evaluated until we all have a full program.
- EDM works well with lower elementary grades but they are not prepared for junior high. They really don't have the computational skills that the middle schools want them to have. We really need a transition year to prepare them. There has been a lot of misinformation about what the middle schools are doing. It does not fit with EDM.
- This is a very teacher directed program that I find difficult to let children work on independently. It requires a considerable amount of time to do it effectively - leaving less time for other things. It is difficult to differentiate well.
- How to get all teachers to use this program - some do / some don't and it really makes a difference in 6th. We need supplements for math skills (+, -, x, /) and computation. How do we get through 2 full journals in 1 year?
- Are the students understanding the concepts being presented to them? If they do not get the concept, is the curriculum moving too fast so that the students do not have a chance to comprehend that certain concepts? Assessments?
- This program works well for thinking and solving issues, but it does not teach concepts and certainly lacks computation building exercises.
- The EDM program is visually overwhelming to students. Most students become frustrated before they even begin to work on the pages in the journal. There are too many concepts per page and it is difficult for students to "switch gears" to various skills and presentations when there has been no mastery of

any of them. Some presentations take as much time and attention to learn as the skill it is trying to teach (i.e. “frames and arrows”).

- Give us the time we need to learn the program. New instructional methods and materials take time to learn.
- It's not working. This is a gifted program. It assumes that sixth graders know decimals, percents and fractions from the first day. The system was incorrectly implemented from the beginning. The readability of the 6th grade reference is “above their heads.” Go back to traditional math.
- This was my first year using EDM. I was surprised to see that both 6th grade classes hated math. (I have never found that before.) I found that these students had no basics in order to use the learning concepts in EDM.
- Grade level training release time like science.
- If we are going to use it all classrooms should be using it, and principals should be checking lesson plans and visiting classrooms to see that it is being done. EDM is cumulative if one grade doesn't hold up their end the next grade suffers.
- I don't feel that the EDM program meets the needs of students who are struggling with math. Please look into Saxon Math as a possibility.
- All teachers need to be trained in EDM.
- Higher paper and Xerox allotment for running computation. There is too much to do daily and kids are frustrated when they don't understand. I take more time to teach toward mastery but something in the curriculum needs to be given up.
- How are teacher's able to meet the math standards for mastery when so many students in a classroom are at different levels? What do you do with the students who do not master a concept?
- Listen more to teachers who are in the trenches - This program wasn't even our 3rd choice at our school, but because so called “experts” liked this program, it was the one adopted.
- The children need to have more time to develop understanding of mathematical ideas and concepts. I have found teaching a main idea or concept for 4/5 week, using problem solving strategies and multisensory materials, and revision every quarter, works much better as the results have shown this year.
- Specific training. Start it at Kindergarten and loop it up through the next following grades - just don't dump it in all at once. Parent classes.
- More copies, more overheads, more slates and markers, and lots more computation materials. Extra practice books, etc.
- Spiraling program may not meet the needs of students who do not receive home support. Many students still are not fluent in adding and subtracting.
- Textbooks to accompany the EDM journals, similar to the Silver Burdett textbooks that explain math lessons in depth! EDM “pre-supposes” that students already are familiar with the material.

- This is a “gifted” math program and is not developmentally sound for young children. The journals are awful. I can find lots of other better (and cheaper) follow-up materials to use with the lessons. Very short on computation skills and facts. Not much repetition or assessment. I could go on . . .
- Mathematics, even in the elementary grades, is more than Arithmetic! Let’s not stop using this program just because it is challenging to teach. Let’s aim high!!
- Earlier in the year it seemed to work well. There are lessons I’ve skipped (slide rule, etc.) at the end of the year, because I felt my students were weak in multiplication and division skills. Another note - it is difficult to get through all lessons in one year. Each lesson itself is very time consuming if all parts are taught.
- This does not apply to kindergarten but as a parent of a 4th grader in ASD I strongly believe in this program for him and would hate to see it changed!!
- This program only works if the teacher uses lots of supplemental materials. In my opinion as a parent and teacher there is not near enough practice in basic computation skills. This program should have been phased in. Upper elementary kids have struggled because they were/are lacking many of the concepts that were taught in the earlier grades.
- The EDM program provides high expectations, structure and diversity of math concepts, in a grade where these things are often lacking.
- It must be given time to work. Also the training with EDM I took this spring was very USEFUL - Please consider using resources to train ALL teachers In-Service or other ways. EDM is very fun and positive approach to math instruction.
- It is very hard to adapt our math and reading programs to the lower range of students at our school. We need programs that can be more easily taught at many levels. Most kids here can’t even read the program - let alone do the math.
- Low students are blown away by the reading intensive format. Success and failure with the program runs in the extreme. It’s feast or famine.
- I have taught this at kindergarten, 1st and 2nd grades. This is for kindergarten only. I would answer differently for 1st and 2nd.
- Primary grades need to know process using concrete --> abstract. EDM doesn’t emphasize this. - Mathland was more appropriate for this age group.
- Basic fact use daily! With more practice on each concept and a better link from lesson to lesson.
- This program focuses on Math concepts and problem solving. My test scores are up! I reinforce computation through daily tune-ups and mad minutes. This is a strong program that needs to continue.
- Training- teachers need adequate training to use this program well - math content classes for elementary teachers.
- What computational materials were available?
- It is very difficult to use EDM with an inclusion model because the range of student ability is too broad. Upper kids are very bored - lower kids are very confused. Also, EDM assumes that the teacher is going to make connections for the students and many teachers don’t they just teach the lessons.-->

and don't link them together. Also, many teachers are still using traditional texts - an archaic teaching tools if use incorrectly or exclusively.

- EDM works well with 2nd grade students who have a good understanding of math. It does not provide enough manipulatives for average to low math students. (All those manipulatives that come with the program are very seldom used in the lessons.) The journals are difficult for two reasons: 1. The format can be confusing. 2. It changes what children do causing confusion. Even our trainer from outside said that the journals pages are not independent practice. Therefore the structure lessons don't allow me to work with students who need extra help while the rest of the class is independently working. We were told that math needed to be scheduled for 1 hour and 45 minutes each day. This is almost impossible. (Even reading and writing do not get this much time each day a piece.) Integration with other curricula areas is not possible. I use to love teaching math. (I was one of the trainers in this district for Math Their Way.) Now I hate it. I have to work hard to prevent tears about math. The pace it moves causes children to feel confused and frustrated. I do a lot of supplemental activities and teaching. Therefore I never get past the first unit in the second journal. I'm glad you are seeking input.
- Ignore the rhetoric focusing on computation - we are teaching thinkers and problem solvers!
- I think for strong readers who like math this is an acceptable math program. This applies to about 5 out of 25 of my students. The rest are confused, have trouble reading directions. The program forgot child development in some of the skills.
- Lets go back to Heath PLEASE. The kids are not getting this program, it does NOT emphasize on computation skills which is so vital. We spent at least 2 hours daily on the EDM program and more time on computations.
- Copies, Copies, Copies. Overheads, Overheads, Overheads. Computation Materials!!!
- Should make it more flexible: i.e. give teacher choice of programs and materials. Some math experts in E. Math strongly believe in one program and emphasize that we should never use Silver Burdett. In reality, we need to cover basics using the ASD supplemental materials which are mostly from Silver Burdett. In any education trend, we go to extreme and reject others. Trust teachers ability and give us opportunity to use any programs/materials so that we can give the best balanced math to our students.
- EDM tends to assume a lot of prior knowledge on standards behalf - it jumps ahead and uses concepts that haven't been directly taught - this program is very difficult - it asks students to do a lot of problem solving and many don't, can't or won't apply themselves!
- Enough materials for all students. Regular written activities to reinforce concepts. Required training for staff.
- Parent input - many parents do not support this program which makes it hard for teachers - it's almost as if we'd have to have parents attend training on the math for them to but into it.
- Having to supplement (it's considerable) means I make so many trips to the Xerox.
- Is there enough time devoted to the instruction of computational skills?
- I teach in the IA program and feel EDM is appropriate for gifted students who finish the book (journal 1&2). From what I hear, regular ed. students are less successful.
- Something easy to use for students and teachers. Thanks for asking.

- We need to be able to make Xerox copies to use the supplemental materials.
- I'd like more challenging concepts for students to learn. I don't really like the homework with the EDM program. It is so open ended. I'd like more structured homework.
- This type of program does not work in all school situations. Those students that move around or are new are lost.
- Not enough basic facts - doesn't spend enough time on a concept - introduces concepts that are too difficult for grade levels. Kids need to focus on concepts - time, money, add, subtract with regrouping - 1-2 problems per time does not help child grasp concept. I would rather have a more traditional program. Less games. More computational practices.
- Not enough time in the day to do all that is expected in this program. We need more practice in computation.
- It is too hard to start the program in 5th and 6th! Students really need the background from early grades.
- More training for teachers - Approved EDM curriculum for multi-age classrooms. Teaching two EDM curriculum is too much.
- Perhaps add more grade level training opportunities to new and experienced teachers. Brainstorm viable schedules for multi age classrooms - EDM is virtually impossible to teach to grade levels in the same classroom.
- We need a more basic program that provides A LOT more practice. I believe that people, especially young children, need a lot of practice (consistently) in order to learn and remember something. Isn't that the way we teach reading? I believe the EDM program moves too quickly on concepts. I also think we do far too much supplementing for an expensive "ready to use" program.
- This (EDM) is an excellent standards based program that assumes teachers have a strong visual math background. We need to bring all our teachers to that point in order for this program to be implemented completely.
- My parents and students do not like this program. It is confusing, disjointed, and very difficult to teach. Transient students are totally lost if they arrive mid year. There is too much curriculum - there is no way we can get through entire program at each grade level.
- This program need to be taught consistently k-6. It is difficult to use with a transient military population. Many concepts are frustrating to students who have not had prior background.
- EDM is difficult to use in our very transient school. It is imperative that students use this program k-upper grades. This program is often frustrating to students when it asks them to perform tasks they are not ready to go.
- Very consistent with state and ASD standards. Need training to teach best. Many k-6 teachers are not able to put 1+ hour time in each day for math.
- This should have been implemented in K-1 and spiraled upwards! These kids are so overwhelmed and do not possess the skills to be successful in this program! I have to use a grade to a grade and half lower. 4/5 books for 6th grade.

- Some grade levels are very good 2nd grade and some other are very hard - 1st grade and K is very lam and hard to follow.
- Linking middle and high school into the progression of the curriculum from the elementary level. Too often there's disparity between the elementary curriculum and when the students get to middle school.
- 1. Issues relating to schools with transient populations: continuity of program, filling gaps, journals - I've had in-district students transfer into my class without their EDM journal - often we do not have that many extras on hand.
- 2. Issues relating to use of copier - the program requires much photocopying.
- 3. Issues relating to depth of concepts. Many concepts need more time and supplementation - especially when introduced - example: multiplication at 3rd grade.
- Teachers and parents have to recognize that this is a spiral curriculum - not mastery based. Research shows mastery programs are not - in many cases - successful. 4th and 5th graders are learning things now that used to be introduced in junior high. This is one of the best district adoptions I've seen in 3 decades here.
- There is not enough computation and drill practice.
- The curriculum is great in the area of math/logic skills development, though it doesn't allow for mastery of ASD concepts unless taught by a very conscientious teacher. Supplemental materials are necessary for memorization of some concepts.
- Many concepts are too hard and abstract. There is much to do in one lesson. Students are easily frustrated. The program jumps from one concept to another - not allowing repetition and the mastery of any one concept.
- Parents have a hard time understanding the material and assignments. They get very frustrated.
- We need "user friendly" reference guide for parents and students - examples to look at that are set up in the same order as the journal work books.
- The program is too dis-jointed. I have glued it together with a lot of Math Their Way.
- Please take kindergarten into consideration as a separate group. The training has helped me but it is still difficult to integrate it into the kindergarten program particularly 1/2 day.
- Our current EDM program is a quality program aligned with national, district and state standards. My students' scores have consistently improved using EDM. They enjoy learning math and are excellent problem solvers. This program aims at higher level thinking skills and prepares students for greater competence in mathematics.
- More training would be helpful. Also - assistance putting together the math games would be helpful, as they are very time consuming.
- Develop a parent guidebook to send home at open house explaining different styles, formats, concepts. Have a resource book for 4th and 5th grades like we have in 6th.
- Most curriculums are written with a focus on 1 or 2 particular grade levels - I think one blanket k-6 math curriculum is not developmentally appropriate! How about a k-2 program, then a 3-5 (or 6) program. Younger students are not mature enough to understand the paper and pencil portions of EDM.

- Have time available for cross-grade or multi-grade conferencing and planning time for teachers. This would help bridge one grade level expectations to the next grade level. It would be well worth the money it would cost.
- Go back to the basics!
- Give it time to work!
- The EDM is not enough - you must supplement with computational skills. Time is a factor - the lessons are long and unless you're able to block, fitting everything is impossible.
- This program jumps around, providing inconsistency in the success my students have.
- Not enough time to do all in 1/2 day. A lot of time to create materials. Kids don't get enough repetition. They get a concept and then don't see it for a month and they are expected to remember!
- You expect too much of 1/2 day kindergarten. There is just not enough time to do it all.
- The problem is that grade levels are not consistently using this even though it is adopted. The result is that students come in with a huge range of ability depending on if they had teacher who used it consistently, a little, or a lot. The program does need more computation practice. My students would be ready if the other teachers here really used the program.
- Teaching materials are too cumbersome and are not user friendly. I haven't heard one teacher who likes EDM.
- I'm very pleased with the kindergarten EDM program. It might be helpful for kinder and 1st grade teachers to have a joint planning time to share what K. has already presented to the students that are now in 1st grade.
- My current class has been very unsuccessful using EDM this year. I had to stop and teach the basics of every concept. I had to start at the beginning. The frustration level in math has risen. Good students are starting to dislike math.
- EDM is incomplete - it should include drill and practice - I teach one week of EDM and then one week of facts practice - it's pretty labor intensive. (Mathland actually did a better job teaching math concepts.) Also, EDM is aimed high, consequently missing the lower 2/3 of the class.
- Computation practice, consistency, and concept flow - not enough in EDM.
- Too many concepts are attempted on single pages. If kids have trouble reading them have a hard time with EDM. Need much more repetition of certain concepts.
- Let us teach to the standards with materials and lessons we like, know work and feel comfortable.
- Teacher prep time to teach each lesson. Reading and language are a large part of EDM, this holds the math learning back for many students.
- Class size and not being able to reach each child after enough to assess and help.
- How many teacher complaints are from 1st year EDM text users? How many complaints are from 6th grade teachers who's students did not have EDM from 1st grade? This is a program that takes time to put into place.

- I find it works best when many of the activities are done in small groups - that requires extra help which we don't have.
- More basic skills drills are needed. How this program affects a highly transient population. How Special Ed. students without basic skills can be successful.
- This program never introduces borrowing and carrying - an important 2nd grade concept. I rely on Math Their Way materials and other supplementals. We also need pre and post test to assess growth. Currently we use Silver Burdett pre and post.
- I believe that much of the kindergarten materials are not developmentally appropriate. The curriculum at this level is very skimpy and lacks focus and continuity. There is very little opportunity for the children to "play with" and manipulate their math tools. Thanks for reading this.
- I like this program for the average-high student. However, it is not appropriate for low achieving students: nor enough manipulatives, too much reading and I don't think the spiral serves them well.
- I believe EDM has some good components, but would be a better supplementary material. It's presentation is very scattered. Students do not have enough time to master concepts/skills. It requires a lot of supplementing and extra work on the teacher's part. Parents do not like it. Students do not like it. I have yet to see the so-called "spiral" kick in and show true mastery of concepts. Four years should be long enough to see it. Consumable materials are too expensive in the age of tight budgets, too.
- On the military base it would be very beneficial to use a consistent series as students are very transient. Hindsight is 20/20 . . . it would be nice next adoption to implement year 1: kindergarten,1 then year 2: k,1,2 etc. -- if feasible.
- The math program has many good components but the students that are struggling need a different approach. The math program takes too much of the day . . . I feel frustrated because I can't do the job I want to do for my students. Also, the written assignments are not planned well. The students need to perform in a setting not practiced.
- It is very difficult for me to use a spiral method and have to change materials/lessons every other day when I'm teaching in Spanish. From talking to other teachers (not Spanish) they too dislike the jumping around of topics in EDM.
- Lots of great concepts and problem solving is done, but there is not enough repetitions to give kid confidence in what they know.
- Please consider that when students become adults they must know the basic mathematical functions in order to complete the bare necessities of life. Also the CAT is not asking for EDM problems.
- How long has the current program been in use? Long enough to measure/ test effectiveness? What kind of math program is necessary to teach kids math concepts necessary in tomorrow's world?
- Continue EDM - it works if it is used. Gruening math teachers see an increase in our students' math skills. No one program is perfect - ALL REQUIRE supplemental materials.
- How well students are doing in accordance with test scores?
- 1/2 day kindergarten teachers - time restraints.

- I love it! We do supplement with other things for computation.
- Take more time on each concept - it's too rushed. I feel we move along so fast the kids don't have time to grasp each concept taught.
- I am not aware of any computational materials. That is the weakness of EDM we need more practice with concepts.
- A new program that teaches concepts and understanding. More repetition of what is being taught.
- How to help new to district kids "catch up" if they have never been exposed to EDM.
- Please select a program that does not rapidly survey concepts and which provides computation possibilities.
- Students need a program that covers EDM concepts as well as heavy computation skills.
- How soon can we scrap it?
- Get rid of EDM program. Go back to a Silver Burdett type of program! The sooner the better.
- If the program is used correctly and consistently, the program works. No one program fits all needs and supplementary materials are often helpful and needed as with any regular subject.
- Provide supplemental materials to fill in gaps in learning.
- We need to continue using it. We have too many people are using Silver Burdett and the students are not learning what the skills they need to be successful in EDM.
- Computational component.
- Needs supplemental math materials for more practice on computation and skills.
- The practical matters - how teacher friendly the program is, the length of time it takes to do a lesson, etc.
- Does not loop enough, material and concepts too hard for 1st grade.
- Get rid of EDM - Get a new/old book that teaches basic lessons then gives problems to solve - ex: Silver Burdett.
- Please consider a new math curriculum that is 1) NOT a spiraling curriculum - the current program is not effective in highly transient populations. 2) Better addresses student needs in computational tasks 3) Does not involve so much reading.
- Please offer other options other than EDM. I would like a book with computation math facts and problem solving similar to S. Burdett - The EDM program does not get kids prepared for middle school - or CAT's - Too much READING involved. If a student LOVES math but dislikes reading they will not excel in the current program.
- I would like you to more strongly consider the opinion of teachers who have been teaching it for several years rather than parents or teachers who aren't using it.
- I think there are enough drill and practice materials. The materials are too easy for my students.

- I would like you to understand that EDM teaches HIGH. As a good teacher, I appreciate the components it offers and the challenges. However, it is difficult to teach HIGH to a class where there are at least 3-4 severe behavior problems placed in it. High standards? I love them! Please assist classroom teachers by supporting us when there are behaviors from 3-4 boys and girls that take 90% of a GOOD teacher's time. Thanks for asking for input.
- It requires a lot of photocopying and preparation. It spirals constantly so the activities appear "flighty" and once again there is a lot to prepare. The manual is very wordy.
- Computation skills. I spend too much time supplementing other materials. If you only taught EDM, students would not know any of the math computation on CAT tests.
- The one thing to consider would be how students feel about their learning. Many of my students feel stupid in math - I like EDM but not as a sole program.
- We are getting good test scores. It's a good program - please support it.
- The upper grades seem to have better success with it since the children have a stronger foundation in the basic computational skills.
- More training; more resources / materials: like manipulatives, etc.
- I'd like some more training if possible! I enjoy discussing success and failures with other teachers.
- I feel the program is good, for the most part. However, sometimes I feel it is too challenging for some of my kids and they become frustrated. Here is an example (Enclosure - counting quarters, dimes, nickels and pennies) My parents have difficulty understanding what to do with some of the Home Links, especially Bilingual parents. Sometimes I wonder if the Kindergarten "package" would be better / more appropriate for first grade?????? These are all negative comments however, I do have more positives than this, and for the most part I'm okay with the program. The hands-on activities are excellent and the vocabulary is powerful.
- A program that better reflects the standards, and teaches basic skills to mastery. There is too much time wasted re-teaching concepts that must be master before moving through the spiral.
- Difficult for the students to understand and read. Difficult for the parents to help!
- This is a truly horrible math program! It is extremely inconsistent. There is no logic no rhyme or reason to it. The kids do not learn any skills. My class was wonderful on the CAT because I give them double doses of S. Burdett EveryDay!
- We need a traditional text book curriculum.
- There is no time to teach this series and remediate student that are having problems. This series teaches to the top math kids and the kids that are struggling don't get it. Teachers with combo classes can't teach both grade levels.
- More training is needed for teachers to effectively teach EDM (free). The standardized tests do not assess what EDM teaches.
- Inconsistent levels of implementation and the necessity of total EDM immersion for child's feeling of competency and success.

- More training, especially for young teachers.
- Pretest - assessment in Sept. Post-test - assessment in May or April to compare growth / gain - - Needed badly!
- Get rid of EDM or use it as the supplemental program. Get us text books and manipulatives!
- EDM is taking us down the road to mathematical ignorance! It is fine as a supplemental program but not as the main program.
- This program is a good supplemental math program but doesn't teach to mastery any basic skills and doesn't provide enough success for most students (which prevents students from developing a love of math.)
- CAT scores, comparisons of scores between classes who have EDM vs. not, tracking scores over a course of several years, teacher feedback.
- This program works well with above average students. However, the average and below struggle because there is not enough practice to master the skills and each time the skills are introduced in the spirals there students don't even recall having been introduced to it before.
- Please realize that you can best judge the success of EDM when you look at results of children who began this program in kindergarten and continued in it. Once the 1st class using this has gone through elementary school, I think you will find very positive results in the following classes. Programs like this should be started in K and add one grade at a time until all are involved - when possible.
- Continue to provide EDM classes for teachers - especially new teachers.
- Teaching math 1 hour per day is not enough to complete both journals I and II. The "supplemental computational materials" would require even more time. This is a 2-3 hour per day program. What about reading, writing and other curriculum?
- This program is a challenge to parents and more parent training is needed to make them more comfortable with the use of it.
- Spec Ed students who lack problem solving/application strengths have a very difficult time with this program. Playing games to practice computational skills is not enough because they don't transfer/apply skills without direct instruction and constant repetition. The "exposure" element of this program is good, but hard for me as a teacher to get use to because I want to see students master concepts. For now I have to be satisfied with the growth I see throughout the year.
- Consider training sessions for parents.
- Computation skills - Why square roots at grade 3 - Why a limit on copies?
- Individualized remedial materials that students can work on independently. They need more practice with each concept before moving on.
- Supple more room for basic math facts. EDM is good, but students often get confused because they often times don't stay on one topic enough to grasp a concept.

- EDM is geared to the upper continuum of student intellect per grade. Unfortunately our class does not fall anywhere near that continuum. Let the choice of materials and program belong to us who work with the students daily. I saw the love for math being lost while teaching.
- I must be taught at all grade levels for it to be successful
- Go back to Silver Burdett. This program is too difficult and chopped up.
- The EDM program is very good for stressing concepts, but WAY too much is packed into a year's time. It also skips around from one concept to another without students having the opportunity to fully grasp what is being taught before moving on to something else.
- Provide materials that are needed! Lower class size.
- When using a cyclical curriculum you should not start at all grade levels. It should start with the children and follow them, not be thrust in the middle. Our 5th and 6th grade students have had two years of confusion, re-thinking, frustration and abandonment by parents who just don't get it.
- I feel the EDM program does not encourage students in math but causes them to struggle and not want to do math. It doesn't encourage students to be comfortable with the concepts and it doesn't help in the students being proficient at the things they need to be!
- EDM doesn't spend enough time on any one concept for the children to learn a skill. It's usually only a one day lesson, then the text goes on to something else. It really needs back up, the extra notebook for drill and practice isn't enough for helping children learn the EDM concepts.
- It is the new math of the 60's - teachers are so afraid to change - most classes are too large and rooms too small to contain, organize and use the wonderful manipulatives. The theory is great - the practical application is beyond reality.
- The spiral theory in EDM is great in theory but doesn't work for initial learning in 1st grade. The spiral is too small. The students need more practice with the initial learning and review opportunities don't give the "new" learner the chance to practice. Also - some lessons cover too many concepts.
- Change is difficult. This is very different from traditional math text. Context of real world is excellent!
- That this program is extremely difficult for low students who need more hands on with manipulatives (not cards) and more practice before moving on. This program requires that the teacher design appropriate supplements for children's needs and moves very quickly from concept to concept.
- Some items are not taught / introduced until after CAT's but the material is on the CAT.
- I like 6th grade EDM and enjoy teaching it, but I have a strong math background. I don't feel the students I get are ready for the book as they have very poor computational skills and don't know traditional algorithms. 6th grade EDM is great preparation for pre-algebra if you get through most of the book and supplement with basic computational skills.
- Consider the fact the EDM is a huge paradigm shift for a majority of teachers . . . but it is very consistent with current NCTM standards. It is the first program that will develop problem solvers for future jobs . . . companies of the future don't need "number crunchers" - computers and calculators do

that - they need people who can work cooperatively to solve complex mathematical problems - EDM is the only program that can prepare kids to do that!

- Give us more academic freedom and a little more credit.
- Consider admitting (like California did) that the whole program needs to be replaced with a back to basics program.
- Resource books for 5th grade.
- We need to have more supplemental materials available in our schools.
- It's new! Many teachers need time to get used to the flow of the TM and a lesson. Getting used to and comfortable with new curriculum takes time.
- EDM is a good program, but educators need to supplement it with lots of drill and practice (i.e. multiplication facts).
- The EDM is a good program, especially for introducing new concepts and helping children understand those concepts. However, in a Title I school it is difficult to implement the program to the fullest and definitely a supplemental program is needed for students that don't get any support at home.
- I think EDM is an excellent program. In my 30+ years experience, the children who have had this program understand concepts and know more math than with any other program I have ever used.
- I believe it is an excellent program. Children rise to the difficult challenges offered by this program.
- More training / more time.
- To get rid of it! It does not account for kids coming and going from the district OR from school to school. Each teacher teaches so differently - there is no test (teach) reteach reliability!
- The amount of time it takes to teach each lesson. To do a "good" job with the program you need to spend 90 minutes each day if you want to complete all of the lessons - This is student time/ work time - not teacher prep. time.
- Change it. The program does not fit the needs of my students. EDM works on the "spiral" effect, which is great if kids start from kindergarten. Our students come from many other states. Many of them (including parents) have not even heard of the program.
- I think that the EDM program is a good program. Don't give up. Teachers are having to change how they've always taught. It takes time. Please continue to provide classes and support for teachers while they're learning how to teach math in meaningful ways that help develop understanding.
- The EDM program meets the state and district standards and will be an asset to teachers in the coming years with benchmark testing. I strongly urge you to continue with this program.
- I believe EDM teaches children that they "can't do math." They don't stay on a topic long enough to master it and they walk away with the attitude "I stink at math." I believe you need to reconsider not using this program.
- Is there any way to bring the resource testing up to par with the curriculum? Kids who are failing math - even with modified work - are passing the math portion for Special Ed with flying colors! It is way too easy!

- Smaller classes, combination classes should teach only one grade - not to be responsible for grades - the planning can be overwhelming.
- Young children learn best by doing lots of hands-on activities with manipulatives. EDM is too workbook oriented. Mathland was a much better program for primary children.
- Hi Mr. C. - Jody Solmonson here. Yes, we have to supplement the EDM program for computation, but so what? The BOOK is not the curriculum, it's just a tool. We have a well defined math curriculum, and we are supposed to be professionals. This is NOT an easy program to teach (I TRULY think that 's why a lot of folks don't like it. You sure can't put page numbers on the board and go correct papers!) but it is GOOD. We need to give it a few years! Thanks for asking. I think the big panic is because the program doesn't necessarily math the CAT tests.
- The cost - journal expensive (too)!
- It seems impossible to get through what is supposed to be 1 years worth of material in one year. This is lots of work for teachers.
- Last year using EDM in fifth grade, I felt too many concepts were taught at 1 time. Not enough repetition and practice is on 1 page. It works fine for kindergarten. As a parent of three students who all graduated in the top 10% of their classes from Bartlett, I am thankful they did not have EDM in elementary school. My oldest son scored 750 on the SAT for math, went to a national math contest called Math Counts, and tied for 1st place in the ASD math competition and after 3 rounds ended up 2nd. He could have handled EDM. It is not a program for average to low average students. As a parent I am glad Ty did not have EDM. My years of experience helped me teach math in 5th grade but I fear new teachers will have difficulty remediating and helping students who have difficulty. Thanks for giving teachers the opportunity to express concerns about EDM.
- It is challenging to teach - difficult to get to the end of the curriculum - hard for struggling readers.
- Visual math - more closely aligned with standards - more ownership models extend the strands to more grade levels better conceptual learning. Both EDM and Visual lacking in practice.
- We really like the Opening Eyes program in 3/4 grades!
- Multi-age classrooms, developmental needs of students, the need to succeed at their present level of ability.
- That the program components require so much time to do all of them that some components are not being taught and so what "gaps" in learning will result?
- How new concepts are introduced? How many different concepts are addressed on a single page? How the page is segmented: is it easy for a child to follow? Is a child given two or three days to "absorb" a new concept before quickly being moved into another new or barely-touched-upon concept? Is the information presented in such a way that the child not only feels that the work will be possible for him/her to do, but presented so that children will want to do it? Are all necessary materials readily available to teachers and students? Will teachers have to spend hundreds of dollars to supplement this curriculum so that children can participate (i.e. are the manipulatives provided or must teachers purchase them or make them on their own?) In my title I class this year, it was necessary for me to purchase and make LOTS of materials to even support EDM in a limited way. It was also necessary for me to put each and every "journal" page on an overhead and guide them through each and every segment on the page. We did these pages together. This worked, they learned and enjoyed it, but this is NOT how the curriculum is presented or supposed to be taught. The EDM program has a lot of

benefits, but I must say that the majority of these benefits draw from the research and development done by Connie Kamii, Ph.D., who I never saw credited in any of the EDM materials. I appreciate being asked these question and will be happy to participate in any and all future activities that enable us to help children reach their full potential.

- This is an excellent program, but takes a few years before we see the progression and results. Give it a chance! The skills link book which came out last year from EDM is an excellent resource for computation. I wish I had one for each student!
- This program does not offer enough hands on practice time for students to master concepts or meet standards. It is very teacher unfriendly - I must rewrite nearly every lesson in order to ensure student learning. (We sure would appreciate a choice of Mathland at our school)
- Ask 10 year teachers in the low socioeconomic parts of town to look at the program. This program is teacher unfriendly, parents don't understand homework assignments. Teachers told by district math specialist children spiral never master things until 3rd grade (concepts being presented in first grade). Then state standards come and don't follow this program. I have some of my kids crying during math time! Only 5% of students are getting concepts taught. What should I do about the 95% that don't cope with this system designed by professors in graduate levels? Well I've taught basic skills in the afternoon so children can feel good about their math knowledge.
- Greater local school choice regarding materials. We wanted Mathland.
- EDM is not, in my professional opinion, an effective way to teach math to young students. Confusing for teachers, parents and students. Not enough computation and time to master a specific skill. Hard to use. Please throw it out!
- It is very difficult - I cannot get through the material for the grade level. Makes too big of jumps without enough practice. Cannot be done independently.
- Parents hate EDM! Students are confused.
- How we are reporting our student's progress to parents. A letter grade does not sufficiently inform a parent of a child's ability. Also, it would be nice to have a consistent set of benchmarks DISTRICT WIDE that we all use to evaluate student progress in math.
- Students find it frustrating. Students coming into my class after more than a year of EDM do not know their basic facts.
- These concepts are quite challenging for my students. I understand that they will revisit these concepts, as long as they remain in our district, and probably master them. However, this method makes assessment difficult for me and also frustrates young learners. I also believe this series is short on practice and drill.
- Bright, capable students enjoy and understand EDM. Out of 26 students, I have 10 students who struggle with the series. I supplement EDM.
- The EDM program is effective if you spend more time on fewer concepts. I feel the kids are trying to absorb too much in a year's time. Repetition of a few concepts may work better. I love teaching the program.
- Consider for teachers that have to teach 2 grade levels (combo classes).

- The numbers of students with learning disabilities who experience great difficulty with this program; the parental difficulty.
- What the students are asked to know on the CAT's, isn't always what's taught, using EDM.
- The EDM program is an excellent program. The way it was implemented into the district was not appropriate. It is a spiraling program and because of that it should have been started for a few years at k-3 and then added to 4-5-6. Because of that teachers get frustrated and consequently they might not use it. That makes it even worse for the teachers who do. If it is going to work everyone in the building needs to use it. We all know it needs supplement, but what program doesn't? Is there any one program we teach totally by the book? Of course not!!! I'd be happy to discuss this with you further.
- There needs to be more drill and practice to accompany the EDM.
- Many of our students have difficulty jumping from topic to topic because of their learning handicaps. But I do like the program and feel that it makes them think - especially higher level math students.
- As a first year teacher it was very difficult to get my own teachers manual. I don't believe they give the basic concepts of math that kids should be learning. I'd like to hear what other teachers have to say.
- I'd like to know how other teachers feel and what else they are doing to meet other facts and computation skills.
- How well it supports teaching of the standards - Is program developmentally appropriate for targeted children?
- Consider combination classrooms. Also consider on base and post that kids are moved in and out a great deal. I feel EDM leaves gaps in their math education.
- EDM does not work in a school with a highly transient population or in multi grade classrooms.
- Too much to learn in one year. It goes too fast. The spiral system doesn't have enough review. To teach lesson correctly it take too much time.
- Be patient with the students, they will learn and be better thinkers. They will be the problem solvers of the future.
- Students need more computation practice. Teachers need more flexibility in using the program.
- Consider that the EDM program is too fragmented and not specific enough for mastery of skills. Personally, I feel we should dump the program.
- Students do not have enough practice with multiplication and division facts to have a good foundation. Students also need more practice with each concept. This series moves on too soon and students don't fully grasp this info.
- How about a more traditional program that teaches addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, etc. If we are to continue this math program make transition to Jr. High compatible.
- I feel the only way for EDM to be successful is for every teacher to use the program. Students can't have years where they are not exposed to EDM. Also, those of us in intermediate have suffered because we had students jump into the program without the skills development at the lower grades. We need to also have special ed. look at supporting the certified students who can't read the EDM

materials. Reading is very important in this series, if the students can't read they are disadvantaged.

- We don't have ASD supplemental for 6th grade. Parents attack us personally instead of ASD over EDM because they don't get it. Should have been added each year not just throw everyone in. Assigned different grades each year is very hard to know curriculum. Doesn't work in combos.
- It takes time to successfully implement across grade levels (each year builds on former years concepts). The basal teaches computation well but not concepts and applications. It's easier for me to supplement more games and computation than try to design activities which promote higher level thinking skills, inquiry and concepts.
- EDM is not structured well for mastery of basic math skills and concepts. It is also difficult for students to use and has to be teacher guided step-by-step. It is also not suitable for low achieving math students.
- To utilize this series to the best the teachers really need to know their math( backwards and forwards). You can't just "kind of" know it. It does move too fast at certain times but that is when I use my judgment and knowledge to slow it down. Provide more opportunities to learn the topics. Every text in school should be supplemented!
- It is difficult to teach all of the lessons in a half day kindergarten program.
- Not all teachers are using it, so it is putting students at a disadvantage if they miss it in a grade level. It needs to be implemented strongly by all grade levels.
- If we are NOT all using the program as it was made to be used, then the students will not have the review and practice with the spiral effect.
- This program does a good job of teaching students math but there are not enough hours in a day to teach it well and all the other subjects. It does not lend itself to integrating.
- EDM is strong on concepts; not enough practice provided. EDM needs to be supplemented with practice sheets.
- Cost of replacement materials - \$\$\$
- Tremendous waste of money! (Workbook cost and Xerox expense for supplementation); Negative feedback from parents because they don't see math journals (I don't allow students to take home because they don't return them to school.) EDM doesn't give enough reinforcement on new concepts taught or basic skills; hence, the need for all the supplementation. EDM manuals are not teacher friendly.. Lessons are lengthy to teach. Students have little time in class to do independent practice on worksheets due to lengthy lesson and guided practice in math journal.
- 1. Students who are absent due to illness of family trips during the school year miss a lot of information that is not necessarily readdressed.  
2. There is a lot of copying that needs to be done to present this curriculum properly. Math boxes and Home Links use up quite a bit of the limits copy counts issued to teachers.  
3. Overhead transparencies need to be copied also.  
4. Parents have mentioned to me that they want more computational math homework.  
5. The manual is not user friendly. It takes a lot of prep time to review it to be able to administer the lessons. Instructions in the manual take too much for granted without giving to the teacher.  
6. Substitute teachers have mentioned that they have a hard time using the manual.

7. Lessons call for use of materials that are not always readily available.
8. Following the EDM lessons in order do not prepare the students to take standardized testing. Some materials on the test are not covered in EDM until the end of the year once testing is completed.
9. EDM uses a lot of cooperative game playing. At times, this causes math to become loud, competitive, students do not want to play, and hard to assess who has the concept and who does not.
10. The EDM journals are drab workbooks which are not printed in color. Color illustrations used for examples are attention grabbers for younger students.
11. Students who tested for Special Ed. but did not qualify have a hard time using EDM journals. The reading is overwhelming for them, and they need examples to use as reference directly on the pages that they are to complete.
12. In my opinion, when using supplemental math materials students' overall responses to math were more positive.

- That parent input isn't always something some schools get so do home links work. My students failed the math assessment after following the EDM lessons without skipping one.
- This program moves too quickly! There's VERY LITTLE independent practice. I don't think there's enough practice in program itself on new concepts. Very confusing. I now have tears during math where there used to be none. I've been teaching for 29 years and have been through a number of programs. High average to high functioning students do well - others struggle and are frustrated.
- This should have begun in k/1 then moved up with each grade level. Now, supplemental computation needs to be integrated into the concepts presented in the adopted EDM.
- Math concepts are developed and expanded. This program definitely take more time to teach. The benefits are greater than with the traditional materials of copying and doing pages of problems. Parent involvement helps support the program.
- Teachers have to supplement too much to make this program work. The CAT test has 1/3 of the test on fractions. The students would not do well if 5th grade teachers did not supplement fractions. 5th grade also NOT learning-memorizing the multiplication facts. Thus, 5th grade math is VERY difficult for them.
- It moves too fast for the beginning learners. They need more time on a concept before switching. Reviews are just reteaching because they don't have enough exposure to remember it.
- I believe if teachers had given it a chance they would have seen the benefits. Unfortunately, many teachers never sought or received enough training and NEVER implemented the program in their classroom.

#### **Comments from teachers using Heath math program.**

- I enjoyed teaching with Silver Burdett for 10 years, using Math Their Way, and math/literature activities. I moved to Bayshore and inherited Heath. It is overwhelming. I received no training and don't much care for the program.
- Are students receiving basic math and problem-solving skills? A balance of manipulative drill practice and math conversation, questioning is essential.
- Heath is difficult to use in a combination class. Need training to help teachers use it more effectively in 3/4 class or any combo

- My complaint is that there is no way I can teach the complete program to 2 grade levels at once. It is EXTREMELY FRUSTRATING. There is not enough time to teach concepts thoroughly in a combination class with this series. At each training sessions, I and others, asked for help in how to do this, and we never receive any answers. Since many classes in the ASD are combination's or "splits", this issue needs to be addressed.
- We ability grouped this year and did timed facts tests a minimum of 3 times per week. We saw a huge increase in math ability and scores!!
- Money -- Training -- does it make sense to the child -- is it developmentally appropriate?
- I want to keep Heath.
- As a new teacher at this school I had difficulty finding all of the math kits. We don't have workbooks and limited copies make it difficult to use any program. We are not getting the materials.
- I believe they learn math because I teach it! The book skips around too much! One or two pages on a concept doesn't seem to flow.
- How the business community is crying out for competent employees! Methods of direct instruction are effective, especially with lower achieving students. I wish you would do this for the horrible science curriculum!
- Supplemental materials which reinforce basic facts should be provided.
- What more math communication projects could we do? Training would be good on that subject.
- My math program is developed through years of experience and materials I created. The adopted Heath program is simply a series of workbooks where students circle an answer or place on a sticker. I have not used this series and have my original order on the shelf gathering dust. A first year teacher would be at a disadvantage trying to work this program.
- No program or I should say textbook series, meets the needs of all students. In order to address all learning styles, a variety of materials is needed. The Heath series is a good foundation that is in line with ASD standards but funds for manipulative materials as well as high level problem solving materials needs to be added.
- The Heath program is really not one I would choose for kindergarten. Young children need to manipulate material for a clear understanding.
- Math Their Way worked for me.
- Computation skills, Directions the students can understand and that are the same as being asked on the CATs.
- I feel EDM pushes the students to do more problem solving and higher level math. I feel this is a disadvantage to the FEW school that use Heath - especially when students change schools and on standardized testing.
- We have no manipulations so it's frustrating for the students. They don't like to rip out and throw away pages. Also not enough "practice" on basic math facts and computations.
- Make sure that the information being presented in future texts is presented clearly, chronologically, and is in-line with our districts curriculum requirements (as well as covering all info on CAT).

- To not only consider math standards but also relating math to real life situations. Also a plan to learn to enhance computation skills and facts.
- It is essential that the program match the ASD and State math standards. It is extremely difficult for EDM students transferring into the Heath program.
- I feel a well rounded math program can benefit from using a variety of different math resources. I don't feel that one particular math program works better than the next.
- Standardized test questions.
- Allow choices for the program that is implemented.
- I feel the workbook format is very difficult to teach with 27 kindergarten students.
- This program is easy to use and has materials to enrich, supplement and review the regular materials.
- I am very concerned it is not "rich" in skills and there are too many concepts in many lessons. I do not consider any one program a panacea. I do not feel either program has enough reinforcement for lower skills levels. Vocabulary the past three years has been an issue and that is no fault of the program, but appears to be a societal trend.
- Need to practice computation and memorization of multiplication facts.
- Basic multiplication, addition facts do need to be memorized.
- User friendly. Can be taught in large groups. Short lessons (Heath lessons are too long)
- The ASD standards are mostly based on the EDM. It seems like the standards were written to EDM. Instead of making standards for all, it seems we made our standards to fit EDM.
- Kindergarten students need lots of hands on experience for math. They also need some "paper and pencil" work to prepare them for future learning. The old (Silver Burdett) books were better for the traditional learning areas, when using the combination approach to teaching math.
- We were on of the highest scoring schools in the area of math using Silver Burdett - I hesitate to be as confident that with the continuation of this program any school will continue to stay in the very high area of test scores.
- We supplemented with Silver Burdett. This was my first year teaching so I do not have my own classroom experience other than student teaching and substituting to judge the materials. However, I have been exposed to EDM, Heath and Silver Burdett during those experiences. Silver Burdett was the most teacher friendly for kindergarten.
- The hands-on manipulation method of teaching is the best way to teach math. Workbooks are too expensive and not as valuable as manipulatives. Mathland was a much better program.
- High copy count needed for extra practice pages.
- Use only one program. When children transfer the differences in learning seem larger.
- Math computation and learning math facts are extremely important.

- I believe that Heath Connections is better than EDM at addressing state and district standards.
- I feel that the Heath program is much stringer than EDM because kids are able to stay focused on one concept for a period of time rather than attempting to spiral. I feel that for the younger grades, it is very important that they practice, practice, practice one math concept before attempting another!!
- I wish my school was using EDM.
- I feel there should be more practice in computation.
- Now that we have been funded for full-day kindergarten at Aurora, I believe I can do a more thorough math program using combination of both Heath (our adopted program) and Math Their Way.

#### **Comments from teachers using other math programs: Scott Foresman or Saxon Math**

- Support Saxon - Excellent teacher - Student friendly program.
- As a teacher of advanced pre-algebra (junior high math). I would like to see EDM stay in our schools and supplement it with BASIC SKILLS practice. It would be helpful if all teachers using EDM had the same skills bank to draw from. EDM is perfect for preparing students for preparing students for the adopted gateways book. It does , however, need to be supplemented with skills - based practice.
- The spiraling method used with Saxon is great except there isn't enough practice! Drill and practice for multiplication facts, division, addition of fractions, etc. There is value in paper/pencil practice. Also need a competency exam.
- Workbook use in First Grade is useless!
- Take a look at the differences in computation skills between our program and EDM.
- I taught EDM for nearly 4 years and used the supplemental ASD computational materials and I know it was a poor choice. I've also taught with Silver Burdett so with my experience I would highly recommend Foresman for 1st with Saxon as a supplemental and then phase into Saxon for the next grades. It is superior to any that the district chose in the past! The computational skills of any child would be enhanced with Foresman and Saxon. Saxon is heavy with problem solving and reading.
- Saxon makes sense to the kids. they understand and enjoy it. My learning disabled daughter really liked Saxon math. She said the other math books and materials confused her.
- I believe in the Saxon math program and my students involved with this series are showing /demonstrating success in mathematics.
- Our math is excellent for our student. It is easy for transient students to catch up with.
- Perhaps look into Saxon Math series to see its merits.
- Northwood is currently piloting the Saxon Math program. I don't feel that Saxon should be considered a viable program for ASD.
- All should teach Saxon, I taught EDM and feel it does not have enough practice and lessons are too long to hold students attention.

- No matter what program, the one teaching needs to support (and buy into) the methods. It needs consistency across the grade levels. The teachers need support to better themselves in these programs. And we need to remember that not one method or program is perfect, and additional methods need to be used (drill and practice)!
- Saxon math has proven itself to support real, measurable growth as well as understanding in math concepts and computation.
- Saxon combines “hands on” with “theory”. I think students need to be able to “think” math rather than continuing to use fingers and other crutches.
- Special needs students - copier counts - parents couldn't figure out homework.  
Does not work well with slower students.
- I like this alternative math program much better. Lots of reading, concepts, looping, concrete activities. Easy for teacher to use.
- Multi age classrooms that allow all ability levels to work together, rather than isolating them into separate classrooms.
- A program that is sequential, builds on skills, and includes all areas of math in each lesson as they are taught. When the math book is divided into chapters - some areas are never taught.
- Availability of materials on a daily basis. Number of students in class. Time spent on prep. and scoring.
- No one program is going to do everything - Once core curriculum and standards are understood it is up to the teachers to round out the specific program to meet the needs of the students to reach the standards!
- Ability grouping of students causes problems when students move on to 7th grade and have not covered all the skills they need.

**Comments from Teachers not giving name of their math program.**

- Poor program. Too much information too fast with no mastery of basic facts. Parental complaints and hard to follow/understand homework and classroom materials.
- In service for 1/2 day classes. Co-ordination especially with 1/2 day classes on what to teach - the “core” marking in the new manual.

Appendix G  
Elementary Principal Responses to  
Elementary Mathematics Survey  
Spring 1999  
Open Ended Responses

“What would you like me to consider when I think about current math programs and how they are working?”

**Comments from principals in schools with Everyday Math.**

- This program was a major change in instructional delivery that came when other curriculum changes were also occurring. Hopefully this survey will help identify where we need to focus some staff development effort.
- Consistency within programs is very important. Concept learning gives a much broader base.
- More public announcements on TV/news about math, EDM, and its place in standards education.
- Teachers report that they are unable to get through a full years worth of material, leaving voids each year.
- On going staff development and budgeting to assure that manipulatives, overheads, etc. are available to support program.
- Too much material, too little time. Spiral curriculum teaches children it is okay to not understand. Examples use difficult not simple numbers.
- Another dose of teacher training, both for the many new teachers and a as a “shot in the arm” for those experienced with the Everyday Math. Two of my teachers too a credit class in the fall and it turned them around in being able to embrace EDM. They became strong advocates.
- Look at the transience rates within our district. Our students are not here long enough to benefit from a spiraling curriculum. They need a balanced approach to mathematics instruction.
- Our 6th grade completed both journals two weeks prior to the end of the school year. Teachers looked at the old 7th grade Silver-Burdett and decided, with student input, they had covered everything in the text! Over 70 % of 6th grade students were placed in or in a review-status for 7th grade pre-algebra classes.
- On-going training for classroom teachers so that they are comfortable teaching Everyday Math. The teachers need to be motivated before they can motivate the students.
- Additional training opportunities.

- Different needs at various levels so a different program at intermediate might be more appropriate. EDM needed to be “phased” in because concepts and terminology needs to be taught at primary as so much information is “assumed” in the intermediate lessons.
- Align them to the standards that the district has established. A lot of concepts are packed into a years time with students really not understanding the concepts. Difficult program for parents to help their kids at home with. Program different from the middle and high school programs.
- Teachers and parents continue to express concerns about the lack of computation - so the teachers supplement. There is less frustration this second year than there was in the 1st year of implementation. New to the district teachers will need training - but time invested in planning and delivery of the lessons is sufficient for our current teachers. Math department has provided good support to the buildings.
- That dramatic changes in methodology and program expectations require initial teaching support. Then they require follow up support and supplemental training.
- EDM takes time to process through the grades. Every teacher must use the program. Teachers who are embracing EDM are finding CAT scores improving and students understanding concepts and how to implement.
- There are a lot of great things in EDM program. However, it is not really a “stand alone” program for all students. It would be beneficial to check with all middle school (7th grade) math teachers - not just the pre-algebra classes.
- The general feeling at O'Malley (from the teachers) is that EDM meets the needs of some students, but not all. It is a very time intensive program, and parents are a big part of the process (through homework). For kids who need repetition it is a confusing program - the lessons hop around and kids are not mastering concepts. Not enough practice is built into the program, and we have seen computation scores on the CAT decrease. A complete lesson takes 1.5 hours.
- Providing teachers with more computational materials for Everyday Math.
- Teachers need to be convinced that this program works. They need to know that it will take time for students to be able to use the skills. Right now they feel that there is too much introduced without time to work on skills.
- How it can be modified to allow students with below average grade level reading and language abilities to have easier access to the concepts. I taught the 1st grade EM for a year and really enjoyed it. I see students looking forward to math. I think teachers need time and support in implementing it. Combo classes have posed some problems.
- Please consider teacher concerns regarding use of Journal II. Many teachers state they are unable to complete Journal and feel it is a waste of money to purchase.
- Math is recognized as being much less “painful” endeavor by our students with this contemporary approach. We will probably not see significant changes for several years and it is more demanding for teachers to teach. However, with a healthy supplement of computational materials the Everyday Math program challenges and inspires our children. It is “different” - but it is good!
- The Everyday Math program is more time consuming for teachers - but better for students. Teachers need to be “recharged” regularly and talk to others about successes. This program is difficult in combo classes and we have had to shift kids to best use it. CAT MATH SCORES ARE GOOD!

- Staff development for new people.
- Change is hard; support teacher training through district in-service days - grouped by grade levels.
- I need training as the building Principal on this program. I have seen great results with my 6th grade.
- Please don't make any changes in the next few years. It is taking considerable time to get it going.
- Parents are having an extremely difficult time with this program. I don't feel that we have used the program long enough to make a good assessment of it's success/failure. There has been a significant change over in staff this year resulting in new teacher having to acquaint themselves with the program.
- I think it is important to consider that this is a difficult program to learn because it is unlike traditional math programs. However, once learned I believe that teachers see and reap the benefits of unreleased mathematics understanding in their students.

**Comments from principals at schools using Heath math program.**

- A math "program" is really just a supplement to a teachers knowledge and ability to teach math. Good teachers are successful regardless of the adopted program.
- Additional support and training in the use of manipulatives independent of the program. A standardized list of recommendations would assist in the purchase of these supplemental materials.

**Comments from principal at school using Scott Foresman materials.**

- If there is a substantial change in the methodology, phase the program in a couple of grade levels at a time.

**Comment from principal at school using Saxon math.**

- Focus on attainment of adopted math standards rather than on various programs/textbooks etc.

Appendix H  
Middle School Teacher Responses to  
Elementary Mathematics Survey  
Spring 1999  
Open Ended Responses

“What would you like me to consider when I think about our current math program and how it is working?”

**Comments from teachers who feel familiar with the elementary math program and expectations the skills that a student is expected to have upon completion of grade 6.**

- We are in mid stream. EDM works well but teachers have 1) not been using it because 2) they do not understand it and 3) kids are getting information that is mixed because teachers refuse to use the whole EDM system. Give us support - DON'T PULL THE PLUG.
- It is too early to see the effects of the new math. I suggest you survey the middle school teachers at a later date/year. I teach in the same style of the "new math". My students stand head and shoulders above other classes partly because of this style of teaching visually and conceptually but also because I highly stress the need for computational skills and repetition of ideas learned. The key work is "balance".
- It has not been in place long enough to judge. Kids before this program were not better and liked math less. There is more logic and theory than before.
- We, of course, get a wide range of abilities in grade 7. Our lowest book is Math 7, which is the 1st year of a pre-algebra program. We have several students who do not have their basic skills mastered at 7th grade. I see a need for a basic math class in the 7th grade for these students.
- There is no remedial math program available for 7th graders with deficient skills. There needs to be!!
- We should give it more time.
- Some students come in very well prepared and some students still don't know basic facts but I don't think we should blame the elementary math program. Our regular 7th math books are challenging and some students are not ready for the pace or the intensity. It would help if we had a basic math class. Or take 2 years to do the 7th grade math book with these students.
- Dear Mr. Bob Christal,

I am honored that you are asking my opinion of our approved District elementary math program. Thank you. I believe that you and the school board chose an excellent math program when you selected Everyday Math. I see a higher level of conceptual understanding of math on a daily basis than I observed with previous textbook series. This series is exciting for the students and myself. I am more enthusiastic about teaching math now because I am being challenged to teach with a program

that can make math come alive for my students. the photocopied example from page 195 is but one of many insights the students are displaying with Everyday Math. I'm sure that Everyday Math was chosen out of desire to do what's best for the students of Anchorage. However, you are asking a great deal from the teachers delivering it on a daily basis. Sometimes it takes as long to prepare a lesson in Everyday Math as it does to teach it. The understanding and enthusiasm for math must be there to make this program work. I sincerely hope you recognize that the teacher is the most important link in any discipline and especially this one. Please support this Cadillac of math programs with recognition and encouragement of your teachers.

- RIGOR, RIGOR, RIGOR. More depth even at the expense of more concepts per grade level. Our students seem to come to grade 8 introduced to many advanced concepts but not really understanding any of them. Also, development of VOCABULARY: MATH IS A LANGUAGE! Can't communicate without an extensive vocabulary and understanding of what words, terms and symbols mean!! Most students need PRACTICE, PRACTICE, PRACTICE on one or two skills at a time from many different approaches rather than bouncing quickly from skill to skill.
- Math 7 and Math 8, Middle School Math, are taught from a looping series of texts. The whole program assumes that students also had math 6 which is part of the series. THEY HAVEN'T, because it is not currently in use in 6th grade.
- Wouldn't it be important to see where the "weak" students are coming from? It is from those feeder schools with the more traditional program or the "new" one?
- Consider a more traditional approach.
- Please discontinue it and allow teachers to use their own resources and mandate math teachers to teach according to the "new" standards.
- After years of teaching, I have noticed, some last year and especially this year, that the students are arriving at middle school and are really missing computational skills. Most students just don't know their multiplication facts. Those things that I expected special education students not to know in the past, were not known by 70% of the students this year. Most students don't know how to divide now then they come into 7th grade. This year it took me a full quarter to teach fraction concepts and adding and subtracting fractions - not knowing multiplication facts has really hampered our 7th grade progress. Also, in my Pre-Algebra class, not all students know their facts.
- I find that a majority of the students coming in do not know how to multiply or divide. They have not mastered these skills and prevents me from covering all of the material I need to in 7th grade. Seventh grade math is basically review of grades 1-6 yet I feel like I am teaching all these concepts for the first time. The mastery of the simple concepts is not there.
- Sixth grade students should know and master math facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division) before going to seventh grade. They need to know how to read and comprehend the directions. Overall, how to use the textbook (math).
- More accountability at the elementary level. Students are coming to middle school with poor computational skills and poor conceptual understanding.
- Try to get more communication between 7th and 6th grade teachers as far as what has been covered. Don't give up on the current program until it has been tried for at least 5 years.
- Increasing computation might be a great idea, BUT not at the expense of less conceptual learning. This is not either/or. Good, well-trained teacher will do both.

- The reason these kids are not coming prepared is not just a math program issue. Parents don't work with them - don't (on average) help them at all. Everyday Math is a SUPERIOR program to Silver Burdett. Even with this MLMS population, I would rather see them struggle with Everyday then robotically respond to Silver Burdett. I can easily augment Everyday with the drill and practice they might need. Also, it is tough to say how this program is going to do when we finally get some kids at MS who have been through the entire program (taught by teachers who are giving it a FAIR CHANCE).

**Comments from teachers who feel unfamiliar with the elementary math program and expectations the skills that a student is expected to have upon completion of grade 6.**

- Requiring all math teachers to take a math consortium class or other class that focuses on using manipulatives to help students really understand math.
- I think it is important that teachers receive on-going inservice and support in the math curriculum.
- Better communication between teachers of grades 5,6 &7. MORE time each day spent on math in grades 5 and 6. It will require cutting time from something else, but I think it is necessary.
- Inclusion is not working. In each of my classes of 30, there are 6-8 special Ed students. Many of these students are not classified as such. The lower end students are doomed to failure by a curriculum that is too advanced! There is more algebra in regular math 7 than I had in the first half of my freshman year. My brightest students are overwhelmed. All my students lack fundamental skills. Many of these skills are rote and low level, but are necessary. How can students factor equations when they don't have single-digit multiplication memorized?
- Across the curriculum concepts.
- Being my first year, I have seen a large percentage of students that don't know their fractions, multiplication tables, adding, subtraction, multiplication and dividing decimals.
- This is my first year in Anchorage and I am beginning to learn about the program.