

**Instructional Materials Committee CURRICULUM ADOPTION REQUEST**

**Text/Resource Requester: Asha Riley**

**School: All Woodland Elementary Schools**

**Subject: Mathematics**

**Department/Grade: Grades K-4**

**Number of Copies Needed: All K-4 Classrooms**

**Text/Resource Title: Ready Math**

**Author: Mark Ellis Ph.D, and Gladis Kersaint Ph.D.**

**Publisher: Curriculum Associates**

**Copyright Date: 2018**

I have taken the following steps to determine the suitability of the above text:

- X 1. I have read it and found that it meets the criteria of the district Instructional Materials Committee, including Criteria for the elimination of sex bias. This is a mandatory step.
- X 2. I have compared it with other available texts.
- X 3. I have compared review of it with review of these other available texts.
- X 4. I have evaluated the reading level and found it averages about grade.
- X 5. I have used the text on a trial basis for about weeks, per district policy and the Curriculum director's approval.

**Approval Dates**

Text Selector Signature:



Approval Date: 3-18-19

Principal Signature:



Approval Date: 3-19-19

Assistant Superintendent Signature:



Approval Date: 3-19-19

Instructional Material Committee

Board of Directors

Approval Date:

**Evaluation Reading Level (CCSS Qualitative and Quantitative Measures):**

1. Qualitative evaluation of the text: Not applicable
2. Quantitative evaluation of the text: Not applicable
3. Matching reader to text and task: Not applicable

**Selection Process**

1. Will this material be the basic text or will it supplement the basic text? If it is supplementary, what is your basic text?

It will serve as the core math program in all K-4 classrooms in Woodland Public Schools.

2. What process did you use to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of this text/resource?

The committee adhered to the process outlined in WSD policy 2020 and used the Publisher's Criteria to evaluate each resources we reviewed. The committee evaluated the following aspects of the curriculum.

Focus: materials focus strongly on where standards focus

Coherence: content across grades links major topics

Rigor: materials pursue with equal intensity conceptual understanding, procedural skills/fluency, and application

Usability and Accessibility: for students, parents, and staff

\*Please see full process used to review materials outlined in the attached powerpoint and notes.

3. What other set of instructional materials did you consider?

Math Expressions, Bridges, and Eureka/Engage New York

4. In what ways is this material better than the other materials?

All resources demonstrated strong alignment to content standards, however, Bridges was not user friendly for teachers and implementation support would be weak at best (the company was very difficult to communicate with and slow to provide support). Math Expressions was also aligned but Ready Math demonstrated strengths in the areas of rigor, fluency, and problem solving. Ready Math also demonstrated they provide the strongest support for implementation. Finally, it is highly aligned to I-Ready assessment system we currently use to monitor student growth.

5. How does this material fit the learning objectives for the subject area?

Materials are fully aligned to mathematics standards adopted in Washington State.

6. How does this material insure continuity with the district's overall program?

Math progression documents describe content and concepts of mathematics across a number of grade bands. They only address standards (not any particular curriculum). Math progression documents were used in the evaluation of materials during the 5-12 math adoption last year, and our K-4 review of materials this year to insure continuity of math instruction across grades and buildings.

2020F3 Page 2 of 3

Instructional Materials Committee Evaluation Form cont.

Bias Content: Please circle a rating for each answer.

1. Presents more than one view point of controversial issues.  
Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor   **Non-App.**
  
2. Presents minorities realistically.  
**Excellent**   Good   Fair   Poor   Non-App.
  
3. Includes contributions of minority authors.  
Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor   **Non-App.**
  
4. Presents non-stereotypic models  
**Excellent**   Good   Fair   Poor   Non-App.
  
5. Facilitates the sharing of cultural differences.  
Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor   **Non-App.**
  
6. Promotes the positive nature of differences  
**Excellent**   Good   Fair   Poor   Non-App.
  
7. Includes the contributions, inventions, or discoveries of minorities.  
Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor   **Non-App.**
  
8. Includes the contributions, inventions, or discoveries of women.  
Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor   **Non-App.**
  
9. Presents minorities in a manner that promotes ethnic pride.  
Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor   **Non-App.**
  
10. Facilitates an environment open to discovery and experimentation  
**Excellent**   Good   Fair   Poor   Non-App.

