

May, 2016

In November of 2015, the Beaverton School District Board charged the Mathematics Project Team with the task of evaluating and making specific programmatic recommendations for the District. The Mathematics curriculum review, as outlined in Board policy and administrative regulation for the Quality Curriculum Cycle, was to include learning targets, instructional practices, assessment, instructional materials and staff development.

Within the review process, the Mathematics Team studied math education in the context of today's world. The focus on and demand for higher levels of mathematics problem solving is evident in the Common Core State Standards as well as within the skill set deemed essential for college and career readiness and success. Our goal is to prepare students to engage in the world as critical thinkers and culturally competent citizens; this requires all students to be highly math literate.

The work of this Project Team has placed an intentional focus on best practices in mathematics instruction as well as professional development for educators. In addition to the review of student data, the Cadres and Project Team engaged in deep discussion about the essential practices in every classroom as well as the necessary professional learning needed to support these practices.

As a result, the Project Team defined a comprehensive set of recommendations that includes:

- Position Paper
- Best Practices in Mathematics
- Learning Targets
- Data Statements and Synthesis
- Math Implementation Plan
- Algebra/Geometry/Statistics Instructional Materials Recommendation

These recommendations point the District towards high quality instructional practices that engage and challenge students in 21st century mathematics learning.

Teaching & Learning

Ginny Hansmann, Deputy Superintendent of Teaching & Learning
Nicole Will, Administrator for Elementary Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment
Robin Kobrowski, Administrator for Secondary Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment
Dennis Williams, Secondary Mathematics Specialist
Debbie Hicks, Secondary Mathematics Specialist
Geoff Hunnicutt, Secondary Mathematics Specialist
Rebecca Carney, Elementary Mathematics Specialist



District Goal

WE empower all students to achieve post-high school success.

MATHEMATICS PROJECT TEAM
PHASE I REPORT
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Introduction	Page 1
Table of Contents	Page 2
Project Team Membership	Page 3
Position Statement	Page 4
Best Practices in Mathematics	Page 5
Learning Targets	Page 8
Data Statement	Page 20
Data Claims	Page 21
Implementation Plan	Page 22
Algebra / Geometry / Statistics Instructional Materials Recommendation	Page 23
Appendix Table of Contents	Page 24
A - Common Core State Standards Mathematical Practices	
B - Smarter Balanced Assessment Data	
C - OAKS Assessment Data	
D - ASPIRE Assessment Data	
E - EXPLORE Assessment Data	
F - PLAN Assessment Data	
G - ACT Assessment Data	
H - College Readiness	
I - Graduation Data	
J - Elementary Staff Survey Results	
K - Elementary Staff Survey Summary	
L - Secondary Staff Survey Results	
M - Math Vision Project Materials Evaluation	

MATHEMATICS PROJECT TEAM 2015-2016

	Other	AHS/SRHS Region	BHS Region	SHS Region	WHS Region
Building Level Admin					
Elementary			Sean Leverty		Cynthia Lam-Moffett
Middle School		Amy Henning			
High School		Jim Healy			
		Greg Therrien			
Teachers					
Elementary				Lauren Jolly	Debbie Starr
				Megan McCoy	
Middle School	Debbie Silva				Jamie Cooper
High School	Brandie Clark (CTE)	Susan Winner			Lindsay Ray
ESL	Kerrin Moeller				
TAG	Heidi Hanson				
Intervention					
TWI			Jessica Tillman		
SpEd					
Parents					
Elementary		Karl Meyer	Davie Strayer		
Middle School				Neil Soiffer	
High School					Emma Winkel
Students					
High School		Jasmine Morales	Sydney Stephens		
		Felix Tubiera			
District					
School Board Member			Susan Greenberg		
TOSA	Rebecca Carney				
	Debbie Hicks				
	Geoff Hunnicutt				
	Dennis Williams				
TeacherSource	Steve Simipson				
Administrator for Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment	Robin Kobrowski				
	Nicole Will				
Administrator for Instructional Digital Design	John Peplinski				
Support	Cris Filer				

BSD MATHEMATICS POSITION STATEMENT

The ability to think and communicate mathematically is essential to becoming a successful and productive member of our dynamic global society. To prepare our students, they must develop the skills to:

- Use number sense fluently
- Problem-solve
- Attend to precision
- Think creatively and flexibly
- Build, support, and critique an argument
- Communicate mathematical thinking orally, visually, and in writing
- Make connections between mathematical ideas, patterns and concepts in a variety of contexts.

Each of these critical components of a rigorous and balanced K-12 mathematics program based on the Common Core State Standards must include the use of the proper tools, including the most appropriate technology.

If we are to meet this challenge, we must provide students with multiple opportunities to engage with a variety of problem solving tasks that reflect the diverse backgrounds, abilities, and experiences of each student. Students should explore and collaborate on rich problems with multiple entry points and multiple paths to a solution that challenges them. Students should be encouraged to work through their thinking and computations in order for them to recognize the patterns, significance, and relevance of the true nature of mathematics. Developing number sense, estimation, and computation skills will create students who are more efficient in their problem solving skills.

We must provide all students with a rigorous, accessible, and challenging curriculum that will develop critical thinkers and prepare them for post-secondary, career, and life success. This will require a combination of materials and the use of multiple instructional strategies, including evidence-based intervention and extension methods to successfully reach all children. Proficiency on learning targets, mathematical practices, and ongoing assessment of student progress will inform next steps for instruction.

Mathematics instruction that develops conceptual understanding and problem solving skills must reflect a progression of learning that builds Kindergarten through 12th grade and grows confidence to further explore and use mathematics throughout life. In order to best support teachers, purposeful, evidence-based, and ongoing professional development is essential to improving educational practices. At all levels, teachers need time to collaborate with colleagues with the goal of increasing student learning. In addition, teachers need access to quality resources that deepen their knowledge, instructional and differentiation skills, and cultural competency to meet the needs of our diverse student population.

Ultimately, mathematics education is achieved through a partnership among all stakeholders: teachers, students, families, schools, and the community. Therefore, the task of the Beaverton School District is to create a thoughtful learning environment, in which all students are valued for their diversity, fostered in their mathematical thinking, empowered to explore and solve problems, and challenged to continue learning throughout their lives.



BSD BEST PRACTICES IN MATHEMATICS

Recognizing that effective teaching is the most important factor in student learning, our teachers need to know and understand the mathematics they teach, as well as participate in on-going professional development to enhance knowledge of content and best practices. To incorporate the following best practices effectively, teachers need to routinely reflect and collaborate on instructional practices, student progress, and understand the mathematics they teach at a deep enough level to be able to explain and apply their understanding in a variety of situations.

Below is an outline of “guidelines for powerful and meaningful” math teaching and learning:

- 1. All students understand that mathematics is a dynamic, coherent, and interconnected set of ideas.*
- 2. All students are supported in developing a deep understanding and the ability to use mathematical concepts powerfully.*
- 3. All students understand and use counting strategies, number concepts, operations, and computational procedures to solve problems in context.*
- 4. All students engage in reasoning algebraically as early as kindergarten and throughout their K-12 school years.*
- 5. All students build an understanding of mathematical concepts in algebra, geometry, measurement, data, statistics and probability, through the use of real-world, realistic, authentic, and meaningful contexts within and outside of mathematics courses.*
- 6. All students participate in an ongoing assessment process that provides an understanding of what students know and guides meaningful decisions about the instruction and support required to move the learning forward.*
- 7. The focus of instruction should enable all students to successfully engage in critical cognitive processes by:*
 - *Helping students to make connections to their prior mathematical knowledge, and between mathematical concepts and procedures.*
 - *Providing students with authentic, challenging, intriguing, mathematically rich, and even counterintuitive problem solving tasks that require them to think and build mathematical knowledge and perseverance.*
 - *Guiding students in how to use representational strategies that include:*
 - *Discussing the problem in small groups (language representations).*
 - *Using manipulatives (concrete, physical representations and tactile sense).*
 - *Acting it out (representations of sequential actions and bodily kinesthetic sense).*
 - *Drawing a model, diagram, or graph (visual, pictorial representations).*
 - *Making a list or table (symbolic representations).*
 - *Encouraging and helping students to communicate their ideas by using a full range of language representations – speaking, writing, reading and listening.*



When observing math instruction in the BSD, one should see aspects of each of the following practices:

Purpose

- The activity is based on a grade level Learning Target, or a transferable skill building to the Learning Target*.
- The lesson is clearly linked to previous and future lessons leading students to understand the connections.
- The learning needs – academic background, life experience, culture and language – of students are the basis of teaching points for all students or some groups of students in order to ensure their success and help them make meaning of key mathematical concepts.
- The Learning Target is communicated through verbal and visual strategies and is used as the basis for students as they check for their understanding.

Student Engagement

- Questions are posed to probe and deepen students' mathematical understanding and to uncover misconceptions. Errors are expected and celebrated because brain research shows that is when the most learning takes place.
- Students are engaged in inquiry in order to uncover concepts, clarify and deepen understanding, and assess their thinking.
- Students are productively collaborating, participating in quality discourse and taking ownership of their learning in ways that support their mathematical learning.
- Students are engaged – speaking, reading, writing and/or listening – in meaningful struggle related to an authentic, challenging, intriguing, mathematically rich, and even counterintuitive, problem-solving task.

Curriculum & Pedagogy

- The tasks, materials and/or assessments are aligned to the purpose of the Learning Target and differentiated to be appropriately challenging and supportive for all students.
- All the tasks/activities are aligned to a clearly articulated Learning Target or purpose to which the students can connect their work and mathematical thinking and have opportunities to explore math topics more deeply.
- When appropriate, teachers use language supports and scaffolds (sentence frames, accountable talk, vocabulary, etc.) as well as hands-on materials and visual aids.
- Students are using one or more representational strategies – discussion, manipulatives, acting it out, drawing a model, diagram or graph, making a list or table – to explore and solve an authentic, challenging, intriguing, mathematically rich problem.
- Students are engaged in tasks and activities that promote learning and independence and are encouraged to explore multiple solution processes.

Assessment for Student Learning

- Students are given multiple assessment opportunities with the instruction and support required to move them forward.
- Assessments are aligned to Learning Targets allowing students to demonstrate their level of proficiency.
- Students are using assessment data to assess their progress, set learning goals, and/or monitor their progress over time.
- Teachers use formative assessment data to drive and adjust instruction.

Classroom Environment and Culture

- The arrangement of materials, supports, and physical environment scaffold student learning and the purpose of the activity.
- Resources, materials and technology are used to promote student learning and aligned to the Learning Targets or purpose. All students have access to what they need to support their individual learning.
- The transitions promote learning and maximize instructional time.
- Students understand and adhere to the classroom norms appropriately and their actions demonstrate divergent thinking, risk taking, respect, and a desire to collaborate.

*Learning Targets in the BSD are written in teacher, student, and parent friendly language to describe the academic goals in a grade level or course. In math, they are written from, and should mirror, the Common Core State Standards and Mathematical Practices.

References

- Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (2012). *Best Practice: Bringing Standards to Life in America's Classrooms* (4th ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Boaler, J. (2016). *Mathematical Mindsets* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boaler, J. (2015). *What's Math Got To Do With It?* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Oregon State Mathematical Standards and Practices*. (n.d.). Retrieved from Oregon Department of Education website:
<http://www.ode.state.or.us/wma/teachlearn/commoncore/ccssmath.pdf>
- Common Core State Standards and Practices*. (n.d.). Retrieved from
http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_Math%20Standards.pdf
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) process standards*. (n.d.). Retrieved from National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) website: <http://www.nctm.org/Standards-and-Positions/Principles-and-Standards/Process/>
- Adding it Up: Helping Children Learn Mathematics. (2001). *The National Academies Press*, doi:10.17226/98
- West, L. (2008, April). Problem Solving Support for English Language Learners. *Teaching Children Mathematics*, 479-484.
- 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning. (2012). In . University of Washington, WA: Center of Educational Leadership.

KINDERGARTEN MATH**ALT 1 - Count to 100 by Ones**

I can count to 100 by ones. K.CC.1

ALT 2 - Count to 100 by 10s

I can count to 100 by tens. K.CC.1

ALT 3 - Write Numbers 0-20

I can write the numbers that represent a given number of objects from zero to twenty.

ALT 4 - Use Counting Strategies

I can use counting strategies to determine the number of objects and I can understand the relationship between numbers and quantities. (*Note: Not on report card)

ALT 5 - Compare Sets of Groups

I can compare sets of groups of objects to tell more, less, or equal to.

ALT 6 -Addition and Subtraction

I can show addition as putting together and adding to -and- subtraction as taking apart and taking from

ALT 7 - Mental Strategies

I can use mental strategies to fluently and accurately add and subtract within 5. K.OA.5

ALT 8 - Use Place Value

I can use place value to find the tens and ones of the numbers 11-19.

ALT 9 - Measurable Attributes

I can describe measurable attributes of an object and directly compare 2 objects with measurable attributes. (*Note: Not on report card)

ALT 10 - Classify Objects into Categories

I can classify objects into categories and sort and count objects into a specified category.

ALT 11 - Identify and Describe Shapes

I can identify and describe shapes (two- and three-dimensional.) Shapes include: squares, circles, triangles, rectangles, hexagons, cubes, cones, cylinders, and spheres.

ALT 12 - Analyze, Compare, Compose 2D, 3D

I can analyze, compare, and compose two- and three-dimensional shapes. (*Note: Not on report card)



GRADE 1 MATH**ALT 1 - Solve and Represent Add-Sub**

I can learn, represent and solve problems involving addition and subtraction and I understand the relationship between them.

ALT 2 - Fluently Add-Sub up to 10

I can add and subtract fluently up to 10. OA.6

ALT 3 - Count, Read, Write to 120

I can count, read, and write to 120 starting at any number less than 120.

ALT 4 - Place Value to 2 Digits and Compare

I understand place value up to two digit numbers and can compare within 100.

ALT 5 - Place Value to Add-Sub within 100

I use place value understanding and properties of operations to add and subtract with 100.

ALT 6 - Measuring Lengths

I can measure the lengths of objects and name the length unit.

ALT 7 - Tell and Write Time

I can tell and write time.

ALT 8 - Understanding Data

I can organize, represent, and interpret data. (Not on the report card)

ALT 9 - Shapes and Equal Parts

I can reason with shapes and their attributes.



GRADE 2 MATH

(OAT) ALT 1 - Add - Sub Using Place Value

I can add and subtract using place value strategies.

(OAT) ALT 2 - Mental Math Strategies to 20

I can use mental math strategies to fluently add and subtract within 20.

(OAT) ALT 3 - Equal Groups - Repeated Addition

I can work with equal groups of objects to gain foundations for multiplication. (Not on report card)

(NOBT) ALT 4 - Place Value to 1,000

I understand place value and can compare two three-digit numbers.

(MD) ALT 5 - Measure and Compare Length

I can measure and estimate lengths using standard and metric systems.

(MD) ALT 6 - Telling Time Within 5 Min

I can tell and write time to the nearest 5 minutes.

(MD) ALT 8 - Represent and Interpret Data

I can represent and interpret data. (Not on report card)

(MD) ALT 7 - Word Problems Using dollars and cents

I can solve word problems involving dollars and cents.

(GEO) ALT 9 - Shapes and Attributes

I can reason with shapes and their attributes.



GRADE 3 MATH**(OAT) ALT 1 - Solve Problems-Multiplication**

I can represent and solve problems involving multiplication and division.

(OAT) ALT 2 - Understand Multiplication and Div.

I can understand properties of operations and the relationship between multiplication and division.

(OAT) ALT 3 - Multiply Divide Within 100

I can fluently multiply and divide within 100. OA.7

(NOBT) ALT 4 - Fluently Add-Sub to 1,000

I can fluently add and subtract within 1,000.

(NO-F) ALT 5 - Fractions

I can describe and represent fractions as equal parts of a whole or set, compare fractions, and identify equivalent fractions.

(MD) ALT 6 - Solve Problems with Time

I can solve problems involving measurement and estimation of intervals of time.

(MD) ALT 7 - Liquid, Volume, Masses

I can solve problems involving measurement and estimation of liquid volumes and masses of objects.

(MD) ALT 8 - Interpret Data

I can represent and interpret data. (*Note: Not on report card)

(GM) ALT 9 - Area of Rectilinear Shape

I can measure the area of a rectilinear shape.

(GM) ALT 10 - Perimeter of Polygons

I can find the perimeter of different polygons. (*Note: Not on report card)

(GEO) ALT 11 - Reason With Shapes

I can reason with shapes and their attributes.



GRADE 4 MATH

(OAT) ALT 1 - Multi-Digit Addition, Subtraction

I can use multi-digit addition and subtraction to solve problems.

(OAT) ALT 2 - Use Multi-Digit Multiplication

I can use multi-digit multiplication and division to solve problems.

(OAT) ALT 3 - Factors and Multiples

I can apply my understanding of factors and multiples. (*Note: Not on report card)

(OAT) ALT 4 - Patterns with Unknown Rules

I can create and analyze patterns with unknown rules. (*Note: Not on report card)

(NOBT) ALT 5 - Place Value to a Million

I can read, write, and compare numbers with place value to a million.

(NOF) ALT 6 - Fractions and Decimals

I can add, subtract, order and compare fractions and decimals and multiply fractions by whole numbers.

(MD) ALT 7 - Measurement Conversions

I can solve problems involving measurement and measurement conversions, including distance, time, volume, mass and money.

(GM) ALT 8 - Understand Concepts of Angles

I can understand concepts of angles, and I can accurately measure angles.

(GEO) ALT 9 - Lines and Angles

I can draw and identify lines and angles, and classify shapes by properties of their lines and angles.



GRADE 5 MATH**(OAT) ALT 1 - Numerical Expressions**

I can write and interpret numerical expressions.

(OAT) ALT 2 - Graph Points on Coordinate Plane

I can analyze patterns and relationships and graph points on a coordinate plane to solve problems.

(NOTB) ALT 3 - Place Value System

I can understand the place value system.

(NOTB) ALT 4 - Perform Operations

I can perform operations to fluently solve problems with multi-digit whole numbers.

(NOTB) ALT 5 - Decimals and Hundredths Places

I can perform operations to fluently solve problems involving decimals to the hundredths place.

(NOF) ALT 6 - Add, Subtract Fractions

I can fluently add and subtract fractions.

(NOF) ALT 7 - Multiply, Divide Fractions

I can multiply and divide fractions (unit fraction divided by whole numbers and whole numbers divided by unit fractions).

(MD) ALT 8 - Concepts of Volume

I can understand and apply concepts of volume.

(GEO) ALT 9 - Two-Dimensional Figures

I can classify two-dimensional figures into categories based on their properties.



GRADE 6 MATH**ALT 1 - Expressions and Equations**

I can read, write, and manipulate algebraic expressions and equations.

ALT 2 - Write Solve One-Step Equations

I can write and solve one-step equations, and prove that the solution is the value that makes it true.

ALT 3 - Represent Tables, Graphs, Equations

I can represent and analyze the relationship between dependent and independent variables in multiple representations.

ALT 4 - Divide Fractions, Whole and Mixed Numbers

I can divide fractions, whole numbers, and mixed numbers, using multiple methods.

ALT 5 - Compute Multi-Digit Numbers

I can compute multi-digit numbers, including decimals, with precision.

ALT 6 - Ratios and Unit Rates

I understand and can apply concepts of ratios and unit rates to solve problems.

ALT 7 - Understanding Rational Numbers

I can apply my understanding of rational numbers in multiple ways.

ALT 8 - Data Displays

I can summarize and compare data displays and make inferences about populations using random samples.

ALT 9 - Communication

I can communicate clearly and explain my reasoning so others can follow how I solved a problem.

ALT 10 - Recognize Patterns

I can recognize patterns, describe them as relationships or general rules, and draw correct conclusions consistent with the correct findings.

ALT 11 - Mathematical Modeling

I can create a mathematical model from a contextualized situation and use the model to help solve a problem.



GRADE 7 MATH**ALT 1 - Rational Numbers Operations**

I can solve problems involving the four operations with rational numbers.

ALT 2 - Create, Manipulate Algebraic Expressions

I can create and manipulate algebraic expressions & write and solve equations with rational numbers.

ALT 3 - Write and Solve Inequalities

I can write and solve inequalities in the form of $px + q > r$ or $px + q < r$.

ALT 4 - Analyze and Solve Proportions

I can analyze and solve proportional relationships.

ALT 5 - Surface Area

I can solve problems and explain formulas involving the surface area of geometric solids.

ALT 6 - Volume

I can solve problems and explain formulas involving volume of geometric solids.

ALT 7 - Scale Factor

I can solve problems applying scale factor to geometric figures or scale drawings.

ALT 8 - Probability

I can investigate chance processes, and develop, use, and evaluate probability models.

ALT 9 - Communication

I can communicate clearly and explain my reasoning so others can follow how I solved a problem.

ALT 10 - Recognize Patterns

I can recognize patterns, describe them as relationships or general rules, and draw correct conclusions consistent with the correct findings.

ALT 11 - Mathematical Modeling

I can create a mathematical model from a contextualized situation and use the model to help solve a problem.

GRADE 8 MATH**ALT 1 - Analyze and Solve Linear Equations**

I can analyze and solve linear equations.

ALT 2 - Define, Evaluate, Compare Linear Functions

I can define, evaluate, compare and use linear functions to model relationships between quantities.

ALT 3 - Bivariate Data

I can investigate patterns of association in bivariate data.

ALT 4 - Analyze, Solve Systems of Linear Equations

I can analyze and solve systems of linear equations.

ALT 5 - Apply Properties of Angle Relationships

I can apply properties of angle relationships to triangles and quadrilaterals, and parallel lines cut by a transversal to find missing measures.

ALT 6 - Understand, Apply Pythagorean Theorem

I can understand and apply the Pythagorean Theorem.

ALT 7 - Integer Exponents

I can work with integer exponents.

ALT 8 - Transformations

I can describe, verify and use properties of congruence and similarity in transformations.

ALT 9 - Communication

I can communicate clearly and explain my reasoning so others can follow how I solved a problem.

ALT 10 - Recognize Patterns

I can recognize patterns, describe them as relationships or general rules, and draw correct conclusions consistent with the correct findings.

ALT 11 - Mathematical Modeling

I can create a mathematical model from a contextualized situation and use the model to help solve a problem.



LEARNING TARGETS FOR ALGEBRA/GEOMETRY/STATISTICS (AGS) 1, 2 AND 3

Note: The Learning Targets are not intended to be used as a checklist, but are designed to be a way to group assessment information into collections of evidence and make summary judgments that will be communicated to the students, parents and additional stakeholders.

The Long-term Learning Targets for the three Algebra/Geometry/Statistics (AGS) courses will be the same. The content will vary in the three courses and be described in the supporting learning targets. The content in each course is outlined below each long term learning target.

Skill and Reasoning Learning Targets

AGS ALT 1: I can communicate clearly and explain my reasoning so others can follow how I completed a problem.

AGS ALT 2: I can reason mathematically to solve problems using patterns and models in both a pure and applied context.

Knowledge/Content Learning Targets

AGS ALT 3: I can understand and apply the characteristics of a function.

AGS1 (Linear, Exponential)

AGS2 (Quadratic, Piecewise, Expand Upon Exponential)

AGS3 (Inverses, Logarithmic, Polynomials, Rational, Trigonometric (Basic))

AGS ALT 4: I can identify, use and solve for variables.

AGS1 (Linear, Exponential, Arithmetic and Geometric Sequences)

AGS2 (Quadratic, Piecewise, Expand Upon Exponential, Geometry)

AGS3 (Inverses, Logarithmic, Polynomials, Rational, Trigonometric (Basic))

AGS LT 5: I can use and apply geometric properties to mathematics.

AGS1 Congruence, Parallelism, Perpendicular, Rigid-motion Transformations: translations, reflections and rotations, Properties of Quadrilaterals, Congruent Triangles, Similarity

AGS2 More on Quadrilaterals, Proofs about: lines, angles, parallelograms, triangles, Diagonals of Parallelograms, Proofs about: the concurrency of medians, angle bisectors and perpendicular bisectors of the sides of a triangle, Right Triangles, Circles

AGS3 3-Dimensional Geometry, Special Right Triangles, Law of Sines/Cosines, Finding missing information about triangles



AGS ALT 6: I can apply the rules of statistics and probability to mathematics.

AGS1 Data Distributions, Two-Way Frequency Tables, Conditional Statements, Correlation Co-efficient, Lines of Best Fit, Residual Plots

AGS2 Conditional Probability: Two-Way Frequency, Venn diagram, Symbolism, Independent and Dependent Events

AGS3 Normality, Sampling, Simulation

AGS ALT 7: I can simplify real and complex expressions.

- Linear
- Quadratics
- Polynomials
- Radicals
- Complex
- Rationals
- Complex
- Logarithmic
- Trigonometric

(As they come in your specific AGS course functions.)



PRE-CALCULUS

Pre-Calculus - ALT 1

I can find features of functions in multiple forms.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 2

I can construct new functions represented in any form.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 3

I can construct and explain the process of the transformation of a function of any form.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 4

I can analyze exponential and logarithmic functions and solve exponential and logarithmic equations.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 5

I can analyze polynomial functions represented in a variety of forms.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 6

I can analyze rational functions represented in a variety of forms.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 7

I can define and evaluate periodic functions

Pre-Calculus - ALT 8

I can analyze the transformation of trigonometric functions graphically, symbolically, numerically, verbally and within contextualized data exploration.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 9

I can prove trigonometric identities and apply identities to find exact values.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 10

I can solve trigonometric equations.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 11

I can solve problems involving the angle measure and side length of right and oblique triangles.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 12

I can solve problems using vectors.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 13

I can apply parametric equations to solve problems involving circular, elliptical motion and/or parabolic trajectories.

Pre-Calculus - ALT 14

I can solve problems with complex numbers in both rectangular and trigonometric form.

DATA STATEMENT: MEASURING THE BSD STRATEGIC PLAN MEASURE COLLEGE-READINESS

To assess college-readiness:

- Students completing Oregon University System minimum entrance requirements (15 specified college-prep courses with C or better)

Each item below refers to BSD 2014 Graduates. Approximately 15% of BSD students don't complete a diploma, modified diploma, GED, etc. and they are not included in the data.

- Seventy-eight percent of BSD 2014 Graduates met OUS entrance requirements in Math. This would mean approximately 66% of the senior class (included 5th year seniors) meet OUS entrance requirements in Math.
- Approximately 27% of BSD 2014 graduates went to OUS Universities.
- Of the BSD 2014 Graduates who enrolled in OUS Universities **slightly more than 15% were required to take a remedial (below 100 level) math class** that does not provide them with college credit.
- Of the BSD 2014 Graduates who enrolled in OUS Universities 29% of them did not take a math class as a freshman. There are various reasons for this.

The 2nd and 3rd columns of the table below indicate the percentage of students meeting OUS Entrance requirements for math. For BSD this means the percentage of students who completed 3 math classes with a C or better including an Algebra 2 and/or Statistics class.

The fourth column is the percent of 2014-15 Juniors (current Seniors) who earn a score on the SBAC Math that put them at Level 3 or Level 4, which indicates College and Career readiness.

School Name	2012-13 Met OUS Math	2013-14 Met OUS Math	% Level 3 or 4 on 2014-15 SBAC Math (College Ready)
Aloha High School	73%	72%	19%
Arts & Communication Magnet Academy	86%	91%	43%
Beaverton High School	74%	67%	37%
Community School	32%	21%	10%
Health & Science School	94%	82%	45%
International School of Beaverton	90%	92%	78%
School of Science & Technology	89%	94%	83%
Southridge High School	80%	73%	58%
Sunset High School	68%	72%	59%
Westview High School	85%	85%	50%

Oregon University System: High School Transition Entering Freshman Profile

Math Highlights for BSD Class of 2012	Count	Percent of the Freshmen in each of the first math class categories	Average GPA for the class
Number of BSD High School Graduates...	2425		
... Entering OUS as Freshman	650		3.06
... Taking a math class as Freshmen	461		2.93
... Whose first math class is remedial (below 100 level)	70	15.2	2.65
... Whose first math class is College Algebra (Math 111)	185	40.1	2.91
... Whose first math class is Pre-Calculus (Math 112)	60	13.0	2.74
... Whose first math class is Calculus	87	18.9	3.01
... Whose first math class is beyond Calculus	28	6.1	3.58
... Whose first math class is another 100 level or above course	31	6.7	

MATHEMATICS DATA CLAIMS

ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE	HIGH
Scores line up along socioeconomic levels	SBAC and Aspire shows 80% ELL and SPED students not doing as well as peers.	Very little gender gap
Some schools are highly impacted.	TAG, Asian, and White students are outperforming their peers.	Huge gap for minorities, seems to increase quite a bit after decreasing in elementary school and middle school
0% of TAG students got a 1.	Middle schools vary widely on SBAC--some have the majority scoring 4 and some have the majority scoring 1.	Large differences among schools
ELL students have a low pass rate.	On middle school materials sheet, there are a wide variety of materials being used.	SBAC - Failure rates in high school are much higher than in lower grades
Race is an issue	"Socioeconomic" data considered- shows that kids in north 97229 outperform the district	SBAC - ELL failure rates are 78%. Note: number of ELL students taking test is much smaller than for previous tests
	Gender seems constant	0% of ELLs* are meeting OUS Entrance requirements--we're not serving those kids *Interpret with caution: less than 30 in group
		TAG rates for '4' is consistent all the way through ES and MS, but drops 12% in HS* *Not comparing same cohort group



MATH IMPLEMENTATION PLAN		
	PHASE I - 2016-2017	PHASE II - 2017-2019
E L E M E N T A R Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Math Framework Rollout ❖ Professional Development for K-5 teachers August 15-19 and ongoing throughout the year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Common Core State Standards Aligned Curriculum ❖ Professional Development for K-5 teachers
M I D D L E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Professional Development Workshop with Jo Boaler focused on developing “Growth Mindset” (1 day) ❖ Professional Development for grades 6-8 teachers focused on Best Practices throughout the year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Common Core State Standards Aligned Curriculum ❖ Professional Development focused on instructional philosophy of the materials and chapter overviews (4 days in summer and additional days throughout the year)
H I G H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Professional Development focused on instructional philosophy of the materials and module overviews (3 days in summer and additional days throughout the year) ❖ AGS Optional Professional Development Opportunities ❖ Professional Development Workshop with Jo Boaler focused on developing “Growth Mindset” (1 day) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Professional Development focused on instructional philosophy of the materials and module overviews for new teachers (3 days in summer and additional days throughout the year) ❖ AGS Optional Professional Development Opportunities



ALGEBRA / GEOMETRY / STATISTICS INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS RECOMMENDATION

We occasionally faced situations when we could simply use standard mathematical formulas, this was rare, and instead the problems we most commonly worked on were usually ill structured and open-ended. Recognizing and defining the problem and wrangling it into a solvable shape was often part of the work; methods for solving have to be chosen or adapted from multiple possibilities, or even invented; multiple solutions are usually possible; and identifying the 'best' route is rarely a clear-cut determination.

Julie Gainsburg, Structural Engineer

Recommendation:

A representative group from all five comprehensive high schools, all eight middle schools and the option schools recommend that the Algebra/Geometry/Statistics courses use the Math Vision Project Materials for at least three years as the entire sequence is rolled out.

Rationale:

This recommendation comes from an extensive review of both textbooks and Open Educational Resources (OERs). Also, currently four schools are using the materials to gather additional information.

Ninety-five percent of the members of the review group are in full support of the use of the MVP materials. The results and comments are attached. The one dissenting vote provided feedback and could support the MVP materials once additional supports are developed. Many of the supports are already developed or will be by next fall. (Appendix M)

Through this review process, the MVP materials fulfill the following criteria...

- Provide rich, open-ended tasks that promote student use of the eight mathematical practices as defined in the Common Core State Standards and Practices as adopted by the State of Oregon. (Appendix A)
- Promote mathematical thinking and communication skills, problem solving and critical thinking skills, and provide opportunities to model problems mathematically.
- Provide practice of key mathematical concepts through repeated instructional and assessment opportunities.
- Being an Open Educational Resource (OER), MVP is flexible and allows for supplementation.
- Compatible with one to one student devices, iPads and chrome books.
- Support the Mathematical Best Practices

At the end of the three-year roll out of the new math sequence, a comprehensive review will be conducted to determine if any additional support or adjustment is necessary.



MATHEMATICS PROJECT TEAM
PHASE I REPORT
APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A	Common Core State Standards Mathematical Practices	A1
Appendix B	Smarter Balanced Assessment Data	B1-12
Appendix C	OAKS Assessment Data	C1-19
Appendix D	ASPIRE Assessment Data	D1
Appendix E	EXPLORE Assessment Data	E1-5
Appendix F	PLAN Assessment Data	F1-2
Appendix G	ACT Assessment Data	G-1
Appendix H	College Readiness	H1-5
Appendix I	Graduation Data	I1-3
Appendix J	Elementary Staff Survey Results	J1-51
Appendix K	Elementary Staff Survey Summary	K1-4
Appendix L	Secondary Staff Survey Results	L1-11
Appendix M	Math Vision Project Materials Evaluation	M1-4

COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS MATHEMATICAL PRACTICES (CCSSMP)

CCSSMP 1. Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them.

CCSSMP 2. Reason abstractly and quantitatively.

CCSSMP 3. Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others.

CCSSMP 4. Model with mathematics.

CCSSMP 5. Use appropriate tools strategically.

CCSSMP 6. Attend to precision.

CCSSMP 7. Look for and make use of structure.

CCSSMP 8. Look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning.

[illegible]

Smarter Balanced 2014-2015								
Grade 6			Math SBAC Performance Level					
	1		2		3		4	
School	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Aloha-Huber Park School	17	28.8%	21	35.6%	13	22.0%	8	13.6%
Arco Iris Spanish Immer	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	5	45.5%	4	36.4%
Arts & Communication	16	14.4%	37	33.3%	29	26.1%	29	26.1%
Cedar Park Middle	80	22.1%	84	23.2%	81	22.4%	117	32.3%
Conestoga Middle	47	17.3%	53	19.6%	85	31.4%	86	31.7%
Five Oaks Middle	111	36.5%	97	31.9%	51	16.8%	45	14.8%
Health & Science School	15	15.2%	25	25.3%	31	31.3%	28	28.3%
Highland Park Middle	62	21.3%	63	21.6%	68	23.4%	98	33.7%
ISB	4	2.5%	26	16.0%	51	31.5%	81	50.0%
Meadow Park Middle	67	25.9%	59	22.8%	42	16.2%	91	35.1%
Mountain View Middle	98	33.9%	95	32.9%	59	20.4%	37	12.8%
Raleigh Hills School	11	18.3%	15	25.0%	17	28.3%	17	28.3%
Springville School	5	9.8%	14	27.5%	16	31.4%	16	31.4%
Stoller Middle	35	7.4%	76	16.0%	65	13.7%	298	62.9%
Whitford Middle	77	36.3%	62	29.2%	23	10.8%	50	23.6%
Math SBAC Performance Level								
Grade 11	1		2		3		4	
School	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Aloha High	242	60.8%	75	18.8%	58	14.6%	23	5.8%
Arts & Communication	12	37.5%	5	15.6%	10	31.3%	5	15.6%
Beaverton High	139	37.0%	92	24.5%	88	23.4%	57	15.2%
Community School	39	68.4%	11	19.3%	5	8.8%	2	3.5%
Health & Science School	13	21.0%	19	30.6%	17	27.4%	13	21.0%
ISB	5	7.2%	11	15.9%	17	24.6%	36	52.2%
Science & Technology	3	11.1%	2	7.4%	5	18.5%	17	63.0%
Southridge High	59	15.1%	98	25.0%	126	32.1%	109	27.8%
Sunset High	76	19.4%	76	19.4%	111	28.3%	129	32.9%
Westview High	146	25.3%	130	22.5%	134	23.2%	168	29.1%
Demographics								
Math SBAC Performance Level								
Grade 11	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Female	337	30.0%	264	23.5%	286	25.5%	235	20.9%
Male	405	31.9%	256	20.2%	285	22.4%	324	25.5%

Smarter Balanced 2014-2015								
	Math SBAC Performance Level							
Grade 8	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Female	251	18.0%	318	22.8%	306	22.0%	517	37.1%
Male	347	23.9%	269	18.6%	305	21.0%	528	36.4%
	Math SBAC Performance Level							
Grade 7	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Female	270	19.1%	311	22.0%	351	24.9%	479	33.9%
Male	310	20.8%	307	20.6%	341	22.9%	533	35.7%
	Math SBAC Performance Level							
Grade 6	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Female	299	20.5%	374	25.6%	301	20.6%	487	33.3%
Male	349	22.4%	356	22.8%	335	21.5%	518	33.2%
	Math SBAC Performance Level							
Grade 5	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Female	260	18.9%	312	22.7%	284	20.6%	521	37.8%
Male	284	18.6%	347	22.7%	311	20.4%	584	38.3%
	Math SBAC Performance Level							
Grade 4	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Female	183	11.9%	404	26.3%	442	28.7%	510	33.1%
Male	185	12.1%	373	24.4%	435	28.5%	535	35.0%

Smarter Balanced 2014-2015								
		Math SBAC Performance Level						
Grade 3	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Female	239	15.7%	303	19.8%	478	31.3%	507	33.2%
Male	234	15.6%	284	18.9%	463	30.9%	519	34.6%
<i>Source: Synergy, Megafile</i>								
*7 and 8th grade student scores from Arco Iris were dropped due to low counts.								
* Demographic groups under 20 were not included.								

[illegible]

Grade 7	Math SBAC Performance Level							
	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Aloha-Huber Park School	5	8.9%	8	14.3%	27	48.2%	16	28.6%
Arts & Communication	27	26.5%	29	28.4%	29	28.4%	17	16.7%
Cedar Park Middle	60	19.9%	81	26.9%	64	21.3%	96	31.9%
Conestoga Middle	65	23.4%	66	23.7%	77	27.7%	70	25.2%
Five Oaks Middle	101	32.7%	101	32.7%	60	19.4%	47	15.2%
Health & Science School	21	17.5%	33	27.5%	33	27.5%	33	27.5%
Highland Park Middle	85	29.7%	57	19.9%	59	20.6%	85	29.7%
ISB	3	1.9%	13	8.2%	51	32.3%	91	57.6%
Meadow Park Middle	58	21.4%	48	17.7%	48	17.7%	117	43.2%
Mountain View Middle	86	29.1%	90	30.4%	79	26.7%	41	13.9%
Raleigh Hills School	3	4.8%	9	14.3%	13	20.6%	38	60.3%
Springville School	4	8.2%	7	14.3%	17	34.7%	21	42.9%
Stoller Middle	18	4.2%	40	9.3%	92	21.4%	280	65.1%
Whitford Middle	42	23.5%	35	19.6%	43	24.0%	59	33.0%
	sbac_math_latest_Total_test_PerfLevel							
Gender								
			Math SBAC Performance Level					
Grade 11	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Asian	46	13.4%	47	13.7%	74	21.5%	177	51.5%
Black / African American	35	59.3%	10	16.9%	9	15.3%	5	8.5%
Hispanic	280	52.8%	124	23.4%	92	17.4%	34	6.4%
Multiple	40	23.5%	35	20.6%	44	25.9%	51	30.0%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pac	6	27.3%	6	27.3%	4	18.2%	6	27.3%
White	333	26.5%	295	23.5%	344	27.4%	284	22.6%

			Math SBAC Performance Level					
Grade 8	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Asian	29	6.8%	27	6.3%	78	18.3%	292	68.5%
Black / African American	37	40.7%	21	23.1%	15	16.5%	18	19.8%
Hispanic	271	39.2%	201	29.1%	127	18.4%	92	13.3%
Multiple	22	12.0%	34	18.5%	49	26.6%	79	42.9%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pac	7	26.9%	8	30.8%	7	26.9%	4	15.4%
White	231	16.3%	295	20.9%	333	23.6%	555	39.3%
			Math SBAC Performance Level					
Grade 7	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Asian	31	7.1%	46	10.6%	78	17.9%	280	64.4%
Black / African American	26	30.2%	28	32.6%	17	19.8%	15	17.4%
Hispanic	262	37.8%	195	28.1%	148	21.4%	88	12.7%
Multiple	29	15.9%	45	24.7%	51	28.0%	57	31.3%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pac	9	34.6%	6	23.1%	9	34.6%	2	7.7%
White	221	15.1%	295	20.1%	385	26.2%	567	38.6%
			Math SBAC Performance Level					
Grade 6	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Asian	26	5.8%	75	16.6%	65	14.4%	286	63.3%
Black / African American	28	32.2%	37	42.5%	11	12.6%	11	12.6%
Hispanic	321	43.8%	233	31.8%	109	14.9%	70	9.5%
Multiple	33	15.9%	50	24.0%	51	24.5%	74	35.6%
White	224	14.8%	329	21.8%	395	26.2%	562	37.2%
			Math SBAC Performance Level					
Grade 5	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Asian	26	5.7%	47	10.4%	62	13.7%	319	70.3%
Black / African American	25	37.3%	18	26.9%	10	14.9%	14	20.9%
Hispanic	274	36.3%	235	31.1%	154	20.4%	92	12.2%
Multiple	26	12.5%	44	21.2%	47	22.6%	91	43.8%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pac	7	25.0%	8	28.6%	7	25.0%	6	21.4%
White	179	13.0%	304	22.1%	311	22.6%	581	42.3%
			Math SBAC Performance Level					
Grade 4	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Asian	16	3.5%	51	11.0%	98	21.2%	297	64.3%
Black / African American	18	21.4%	26	31.0%	26	31.0%	14	16.7%
Hispanic	185	24.1%	304	39.6%	187	24.3%	92	12.0%
Multiple	24	9.4%	56	22.0%	85	33.3%	90	35.3%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pac	6	20.0%	13	43.3%	6	20.0%	5	16.7%
White	119	8.2%	321	22.1%	467	32.1%	546	37.6%

			Math SBAC Performance Level					
Grade 3	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Asian	16	3.7%	40	9.2%	97	22.4%	281	64.7%
Black / African American	18	27.3%	22	33.3%	20	30.3%	6	9.1%
Hispanic	252	31.3%	230	28.6%	226	28.1%	96	11.9%
Multiple	33	13.2%	37	14.8%	82	32.8%	98	39.2%
White	141	9.8%	249	17.3%	508	35.4%	539	37.5%

[illegible]

		Math SBAC Performance Level						
Grade 8	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
ELL	73	73.0%	12	12.0%	10	10.0%	5	5.0%
TAG	6	1.1%	15	2.7%	54	9.6%	485	86.6%
SpEd	230	66.5%	58	16.8%	40	11.6%	18	5.2%
		Math SBAC Performance Level						
Grade 7	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
ELL	106	78.5%	13	9.6%	10	7.4%	6	4.4%
TAG	3	0.5%	8	1.3%	71	11.9%	515	86.3%
SpEd	233	65.4%	60	16.9%	38	10.7%	25	7.0%
		Math SBAC Performance Level						
Grade 6	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
ELL	170	85.0%	23	11.5%	6	3.0%	1	0.5%
TAG	6	0.8%	22	3.1%	86	12.0%	601	84.1%
SpEd	237	65.5%	60	16.6%	40	11.0%	25	6.9%
		Math SBAC Performance Level						
Grade 5	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
ELL	193	62.9%	77	25.1%	24	7.8%	13	4.2%
TAG	0	0.0%	12	1.8%	69	10.5%	577	87.7%
SpEd	213	60.5%	66	18.8%	44	12.5%	29	8.2%
		Math SBAC Performance Level						
Grade 4	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
ELL	177	41.8%	171	40.4%	51	12.1%	24	5.7%
TAG	0	0.0%	4	0.6%	77	11.5%	587	87.9%
SpEd	155	41.0%	102	27.0%	71	18.8%	50	13.2%

		Math SBAC Performance Level						
Grade 3	1		2		3		4	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
ELL	234	46.6%	165	32.9%	84	16.7%	19	3.8%
TAG	0	0.0%	8	1.4%	66	11.4%	506	87.2%
SpEd	147	42.0%	73	20.9%	82	23.4%	48	13.7%

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Economically Disadvantaged	65.4
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	English Learners	67
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Students with Disabilities	27.8
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Asian	85.7
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Black/African American	52.2
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Hispanic/Latino	65.5
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Multi-Racial	77.8
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	White	67.5
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Female	70.2
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Male	63.5
1153	Aloha-Huber Park School	Grade(s) PK-8	E	Migrant	73.3
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Economically Disadvantaged	55.6
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	English Learners	50
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Students with Disabilities	44.4
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Talented and Gifted	*
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Asian	*
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Black/African American	*
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Hispanic/Latino	64.5
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Multi-Racial	90.9
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	White	86.7
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Female	78.6
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Male	80.5
4805	Arco Iris Spanish Immersion School	Grade(s) 1-7	E	Migrant	*
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	47.5
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	50
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	35.3
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	78.6
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	<5
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	53.2
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	70
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	71.6
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	57
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	60.8
1154	Barnes Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	50
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	59.7
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	51.3
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	27.5
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	81.3
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	53.3
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	53.5
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	77.4
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	73.7
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	66.5
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	67
1155	Beaver Acres Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	15.4
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	>95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	>95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	>95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	>95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	>95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	>95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	>95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	>95
1156	Bethany Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	57.9
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	76.9
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	66.7
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	*
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	91.3
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	90.9
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	88
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	95
4671	Bonny Slope Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	56
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	50
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	39.1
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	88.2
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	33.3
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	82.4
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	92.2
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	80.3
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	87.3
1158	Cedar Mill Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	41.5

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	27.1
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	25.8
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	66.7
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	25
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	31.5
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	66.7
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	71.4
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	56.8
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	47.1
1159	Chehalem Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	77.3
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	69.2
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	50
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	88.6
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	65.5
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	84
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	84.8
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	80
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	86.6
1160	Cooper Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	60.8
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	56.7
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	50
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	87.9

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	53.7
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	>95
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	87.9
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	77.9
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	77
1162	Elmonica Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	56.6
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	40.4
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	45.5
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	75
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	50
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	79.2
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	76.8
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	69.3
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	71.9
1161	Errol Hassell Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	>95
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	>95
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	74.3
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	>95
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	85
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	94.9

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	94.9
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	>95
1370	Findley Elementary	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	42.2
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	26.6
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	27.8
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	*
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	18.2
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	34.7
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	84.6
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	74.6
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	67.9
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	56.1
1163	Fir Grove Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	52
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	46.5
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	35.9
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	87.5
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	46.7
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	66.7
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	74
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	62
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	59.6
1157	Greenway Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	67.3
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	63.6

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	40.7
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	85.2
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	60.6
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	76.9
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	78.9
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	77.9
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	69.5
1164	Hazeldale Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	61
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	54.3
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	60.7
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	48.6
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	88.2
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	83
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	81.3
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	79.4
1165	Hiteon Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Economically Disadvantaged	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	English Learners	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Students with Disabilities	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Talented and Gifted	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Asian	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Black/African American	*

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Hispanic/Latino	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Multi-Racial	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	White	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Female	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Male	*
4867	Hope Chinese Charter School	Grade(s) K-2	E	Migrant	*
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	70.8
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	90.7
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	83.3
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	76.9
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	>95
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	89.3
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	92.1
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	>95
3437	Jacob Wismer Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	56.3
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	58.1
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	20.4
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	93.8
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	83.3
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	62.5
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	54.3
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	56.5
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	67.2
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	62.4

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	61.3
1166	Kinnaman Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	50.4
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	50
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	29.3
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	80
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	43.9
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	85.7
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	62.5
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	65.2
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	53.5
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	64.2
1168	McKay Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	53.4
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	49.5
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	34
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	86.1
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	38.1
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	47.5
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	45.5
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	62.5
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	72.9
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	61
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	65.7
1169	McKinley Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	53.6
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	47.6
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	42.9

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	52.4
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	76.5
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	77.2
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	74.5
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	75.6
1170	Montclair Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	72.1
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	80.8
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	68
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	83.8
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	82.1
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	86.4
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	86.5
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	85.7
1303	Nancy Ryles Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	69
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	66.7
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	52.4
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	62.5

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	86.4
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	89.5
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	89.6
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	85.7
1171	Oak Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Economically Disadvantaged	58.3
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	English Learners	51.6
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Students with Disabilities	23.3
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Asian	76.5
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Black/African American	28.6
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Hispanic/Latino	56.1
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Multi-Racial	84.6
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	White	87.2
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Female	76.8
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Male	80
1172	Raleigh Hills Elementary School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Migrant	*
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	57
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	49
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	42.3
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	*
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	50
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	>95
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	89.6
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	85.9
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	73.6

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1173	Raleigh Park Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	68.9
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	60
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	53.3
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	60
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	81.8
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	85.9
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	81.6
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	82.4
1174	Ridgewood Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	67.2
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	72.7
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	59.6
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	93.9
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	50
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	90.5
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	87.8
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	83.7
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	84.6
1175	Rock Creek Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	81
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	83.7
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	65
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	80
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	93.9
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	90.4
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	93
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	88.7
2781	Scholls Heights Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	73.7
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	74.2
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	63
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	93
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	64
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	86.1
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	92.6
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	92.4
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	85.1
1270	Sexton Mountain Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Economically Disadvantaged	68.3
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	English Learners	76.1
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Students with Disabilities	52.8
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Asian	>95
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Black/African American	80
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Hispanic/Latino	61.5
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Multi-Racial	82.8

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	White	85.1
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Female	84.3
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Male	85.1
4712	Springville K-8 School	Grade(s) K-8	E	Migrant	*
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	48.6
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	48.8
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	38.1
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	92.3
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	38.1
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	85.7
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	82.5
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	70.7
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	75.2
1176	Terra Linda Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	55.3
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	54.7
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	18.2
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	*
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	55
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	62.5
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	80.9
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	59.4
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	63.6
1177	Vose Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	50

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	82.4
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	90
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	60
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	>95
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	77.8
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	83.3
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	84
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	83.1
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	85.7
1178	West Tualatin View Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	*
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Economically Disadvantaged	45.5
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	English Learners	38.9
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Students with Disabilities	22.2
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Talented and Gifted	>95
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Asian	40.9
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Black/African American	*
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Hispanic/Latino	39.2
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Multi-Racial	63.6
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	White	88
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Female	43.8
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Male	55
1179	William Walker Elementary School	Grade(s) K-5	E	Migrant	12.5
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Economically Disadvantaged	52.6
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	English Learners	51.3
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Students with Disabilities	35
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Talented and Gifted	>95
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	American Indian/Alaska Native	*

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Asian	88.4
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Black/African American	53.3
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Hispanic/Latino	50.9
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Multi-Racial	82.5
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	57.1
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	White	88.4
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Female	81.9
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Male	77.6
1180	Cedar Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Migrant	*
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Economically Disadvantaged	62.1
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	English Learners	63.5
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Students with Disabilities	38
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Talented and Gifted	>95
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Asian	93.2
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Black/African American	58.3
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Hispanic/Latino	58.6
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Multi-Racial	81.8
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	68.4
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	White	80.2
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Female	76.9
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Male	76.2
1319	Conestoga Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Migrant	62.5
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Economically Disadvantaged	55.1
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	English Learners	54.1
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Students with Disabilities	21.8
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Talented and Gifted	>95
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Asian	75.6
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Black/African American	54.2
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Hispanic/Latino	52.6
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Multi-Racial	79.7
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	28.6

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	White	71.8
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Female	66.7
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Male	62
1181	Five Oaks Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Migrant	39.1
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Economically Disadvantaged	45.8
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	English Learners	49.1
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Students with Disabilities	33.3
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Talented and Gifted	>95
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Asian	76.6
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Black/African American	47.1
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Hispanic/Latino	46.8
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Multi-Racial	80.6
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	62.5
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	White	77.2
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Female	74.4
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Male	67.5
1184	Highland Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Migrant	42.9
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Economically Disadvantaged	52.5
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	English Learners	52.3
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Students with Disabilities	26.2
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Talented and Gifted	>95
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Asian	91.1
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Black/African American	43.5
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Hispanic/Latino	47.7
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Multi-Racial	86.8
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	White	83.6
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Female	75.2
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Male	72.1
1182	Meadow Park Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Migrant	36.4
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Economically Disadvantaged	51.5

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade
Source: Synergy

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	English Learners	46.2
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Students with Disabilities	18.9
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Talented and Gifted	>95
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Asian	73
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Black/African American	53.3
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Hispanic/Latino	44.8
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Multi-Racial	69
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	54.5
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	White	68.2
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Female	61.7
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Male	59.8
1183	Mountain View Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Migrant	20
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Economically Disadvantaged	73.3
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	English Learners	92.9
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Students with Disabilities	54.2
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Talented and Gifted	>95
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	American Indian/Alaska Native	*
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Asian	>95
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Black/African American	83.3
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Hispanic/Latino	77.5
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Multi-Racial	93.2
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	White	91.6
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Female	93.1
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Male	92.8
2782	Stoller Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Migrant	*
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Economically Disadvantaged	51.6
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	English Learners	49.8
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Students with Disabilities	22.7
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Talented and Gifted	>95
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	American Indian/Alaska Native	>95
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Asian	92.5

2013-14 OAKS Math by Grade*Source: Synergy*

School ID	School Name	Grades Offered	School Type	SubGroup	Math Pct Met 2013-14
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Black/African American	18.2
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Hispanic/Latino	47.8
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Multi-Racial	68.2
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	57.1
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	White	82.6
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Female	66.7
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Male	68.2
1185	Whitford Middle School	Grade(s) 6-8	M	Migrant	18.2

ASPIRE 2015-2016					
8th grade Aspire Mathematics ACT Readiness Benchmark					
	No		Yes		
School	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	
Aloha-Huber Park School	40	72.7%	15	27.3%	
Arts & Communication	65	63.1%	38	36.9%	
Cedar Park Middle	177	56.9%	134	43.1%	
Conestoga Middle	199	69.6%	87	30.4%	
Five Oaks Middle	255	78.2%	71	21.8%	
Health & Science School	72	60.0%	48	40.0%	
Highland Park Middle	175	61.4%	110	38.6%	
ISB	32	20.0%	128	80.0%	
Meadow Park Middle	130	50.8%	126	49.2%	
Mountain View Middle	232	78.1%	65	21.9%	
Raleigh Hills School	25	39.7%	38	60.3%	
Springville School	15	29.4%	36	70.6%	
Stoller Middle	130	29.1%	317	70.9%	
Whitford Middle	122	62.6%	73	37.4%	
District	1669	56.5%	1286	43.5%	
8th grade Aspire Mathematics ACT Readiness Benchmark					
	No		Yes		
Gender	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	
Male	858	56.5%	659	43.4%	
Female	811	56.4%	627	43.6%	
8th grade Aspire Mathematics ACT Readiness Benchmark					
	No		Yes		
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	
Tag	47	8.2%	528	91.8%	
SpEd	312	92.3%	26	7.7%	
ELL	134	91.2%	13	8.8%	
8th grade Aspire Mathematics ACT Readiness Benchmark					
	No		Yes		
Race	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	
Asian	118	26.8%	323	73.2%	
Black / African American	78	81.3%	18	18.7%	
Hispanic	569	82.1%	124	17.9%	
Multiple	104	55.9%	82	44.1%	
White	771	51.3%	732	48.7%	

8th Grade

Subject	District Mean 06-07	District Mean 11-Oct	District Mean 12-Nov	District Mean 13-Dec	District Mean 13-14	District Mean 14-15	National Mean Norm
English	15.2	15.6	15.8	15.4	15.8	15.7	14.7
Mathem atics	16.2	16.8	16.7	16.7	17	16.3	15.5
Reading	15.2	15.8	15.5	15.8	16.1	15.3	14.6
Science	17.5	17.8	17.6	17.5	17.8	17.5	16.6
Composi te	16.2	16.6	16.5	16.5	16.8	16.4	15.5

Subject	Asian	White	Hispanic	Black	Multiraci al
English	18.1 (0)	16.5 (- .2)	12.8 (+.2)	13.2 (+.1)	16.9 (+.9)
Mathem atics	19.4 (- .4)	16.8 (- .8)	13.6 (- .8)	14.0 (- .7)	17.2 (0)
Reading	17.3 (- .5)	16.0 (- .9)	12.9 (- .5)	13.6 (- .7)	16.5 (0)
Science	19.7 (- .1)	17.9 (- .5)	15.3 (- .3)	15.6 (- .4)	18.3 (+.3)
Composi te	18.8 (- .2)	16.9 (- .6)	13.8 (- .3)	14.2 (- .5)	17.3 (+.3)

Subject	Male Mean Score	Female Mean Score
English	15.2 (0)	16.3 (- .2)
Mathem atics	16.4 (- .8)	16.3 (- .6)
Reading	15.0 (- .7)	15.7 (- .8)

Science	17.2 (- .5)	17.8 (- .2)
Composite	16.1 (- .5)	16.6 (- .5)


Subject	SpEd	ELL	TAG
English	11.2 (- .2)	9.7 (0)	20.9 (- .3)
Mathematics	11.9 (- .9)	10.9 (- 1.2)	21.2 (- .8)
Reading	11.6 (- .5)	10.4 (- .4)	20.1 (- .7)
Science	13.9 (- .5)	13.1 (- .3)	21.6 (- .2)
Composite	12.3 (- .5)	11.1 (- .6)	21.1 (- .5)

	English	Math	Reading	Science	Composite
ACMA	16.9 (- .7)	16.0 (- .2)	16.9 (0)	18.4 (+.2)	17.2 (- .2)
Aloha-Huber Park	13.6 (+1.8)	14.2 (- .9)	13.0 (- .5)	15.8 (0)	14.2 (0)
Cedar Park	15.7 (- .2)	16.0 (- .6)	15.3 (- .9)	17.5 (- .1)	16.3 (- .4)
Conestoga	15.2 (0)	16.1 (- .8)	14.6 (- 1.5)	17.0 (- .8)	15.9 (- .8)
Five Oaks	13.2 (0)	13.7 (- 1.1)	12.9 (- .6)	15.0 (- .8)	13.8 (- .7)
Health and Science	15.5 (+.1)	16.2 (- .5)	15.2 (- 1.1)	17.0 (- .6)	16.1 (- .5)
Highland Park	15.2 (- .2)	15.5 (- .7)	15.2 (- .2)	16.9 (- .6)	15.8 (- .5)
ISB	17.9 (- .4)	17.9 (- 1.1)	17.3 (- 1.0)	19.5 (- .3)	18.3 (- .7)

Meadow Park	13.3 (-.9)	14.3 (-1.0)	13.1 (-1.0)	15.5 (-.9)	14.2 (-.9)
Mt. View	13.4 (-.8)	14.6 (-.6)	13.6 (-.7)	16.1 (-.2)	14.5 (-.6)
Rachel Carson	16.4 (-1.4)	17.0 (-1.5)	16.7 (-1.6)	18.6 (-1.0)	17.3 (-1.4)
Raleigh Hills	16.8 (-.3)	16.7 (-.2)	16.4 (-1.1)	17.8 (-.5)	17.1 (-.5)
Springville	15.6 (+.6)	16.3 (-1.5)	16.1 (-.4)	18.0 (+.4)	16.6 (-.2)
Stoller	16.8 (+.2)	17.6 (-.8)	15.9 (-.7)	18.1 (-.4)	17.2 (-.5)
SUMMA Cedar Park	22	22.3	20.9	22.6	22
SUMMA Highland Park	21.6	23	21.1	22.8	22.3
SUMMA North	21.8 (-1.0)	22.7 (-1.1)	21.5 (-.4)	22.8 (-.3)	22.3 (-.7)
SUMMA South	22.3 (-.3)	22.7 (-.9)	20.7 (-0.8)	22.4 (-.5)	22.1 (-.7)
SUMMA Stoller	22.2 (-.7)	23.9 (0)	21.5 (-.5)	23.2 (0)	22.9 (-.2)
Whitford	13.6 (+.3)	14.1 (-1.1)	13.2 (-1.4)	16.1 (-.2)	14.4 (-.6)

9th Grade

9th Grade Mean EXPLORE Scores



Subject	Asian	Black	White	Hispanic	Multiracial
English	19.1 (-.1)	14.5 (-.2)	18.0 (-1.0)	14.5 (+.1)	18.7 (-.2)
Mathematics	19.9 (-.9)	14.9 (-.3)	17.9 (-1.4)	14.8 (-.8)	18.9 (-.3)
Reading	18.3 (-.5)	14.6 (+.1)	17.4 (-.8)	14.4 (-.1)	18.0 (+.1)
Science	20.6 (+.1)	16.9 (+.6)	19.2 (-.2)	16.5 (0)	19.7 (+.3)
Composi te	19.6 (-.4)	15.3 (0)	18.3 (-.8)	15.2 (-.2)	19.0 (0)

Subject	Female	Male
English	18.0 (-.3)	16.6 (-.8)
Mathematics	17.4 (-.7)	17.5 (-1.3)
Reading	17.3 (-.3)	16.3 (-.7)
Science	19.0 (+.2)	18.5 (-.2)
Composi te	18.0 (-.4)	17.4 (-.7)

Subject	SPED	ESL	TAG
English	11.9 (-.7)	10.6 (-.2)	21.8 (-1.1)
Mathematics	12.4 (-1.4)	12.1 (-.8)	22.3 (-1.2)
Reading	12.3 (-.5)	11.3 (+.1)	21.1 (-.8)
Science	14.4 (-.7)	14.6 (+.5)	22.5 (-.3)
Composi te	12.9 (-.8)	12.3 (-.1)	22.1 (-.8)

School	English	Math	Reading	Science	Composite
Aloha	15.6 (-.3)	15.9 (-1.2)	15.6 (0)	17.4 (+.2)	16.3 (-.3)
ACMA	18.2 (-1.6)	17.2 (-1.0)	17.7 (-.7)	19.3 (-.4)	18.2 (-1.0)
Beaverton	16.5 (-.7)	16.5 (-1.3)	16.0 (-.7)	18.0 (-.1)	16.9 (-.7)
Community*	11.1 (-1.5)	10.7 (-2.1)	11.4 (-.1)	14.2 (-.8)	11.9 (-1.3)
Health and Science	16.7 (+.1)	17.7 (-.3)	16.8 (-.2)	19.0 (+.3)	17.7 (0)
ISB	19.8 (+.1)	19.4 (-1.1)	19.1 (-.4)	20.6 (-.1)	19.8 (-.4)
SST	20.0 (+.9)	20.7 (+.2)	19.2 (+.5)	20.8 (+.2)	20.3 (+.5)
Southridge	17.6 (-.5)	17.5 (-1.2)	16.8 (-.5)	18.8 (0)	17.8 (-.5)
Sunset	18.1 (-.8)	18.4 (-.9)	17.4 (-.7)	19.3 (-.3)	18.4 (-.7)
Westview	17.5 (-.6)	18.0 (-.7)	17.0 (-.6)	19.1 (-.1)	18.1 (-.5)

PLAN 2014-15

Note: This was the last year this test was offered by ACT.


School	English	Math	Reading	Science	Composite
Aloha	15.8 (-1.3)	17.4 (-.6)	16.2 (-.6)	18.1 (-1.0)	17.0 (-.9)
ACMA	19.6 (-1.3)	19.3 (-.5)	19.8 (+.2)	20.7 (+.1)	19.9 (-.5)
Beaverton	17.2 (-1.5)	19.4 (-.3)	18.3 (0)	19.3 (-.9)	18.7 (-.7)
Community	13.1 (-.9)	13.8 (+.3)	12.3 (-2.5)	14.7 (-.8)	13.6 (-.9)
ISB	21.1 (-.7)	22.5 (+.5)	21.4 (+.4)	22.6 (-.4)	22.0 (-.1)
Health and Science	16.9 (-.6)	19.8 (+1.9)	17.2 (+.9)	20.6 (+1.2)	18.7 (+.8)
SST	19.7(-3.2)	22.3 (-2.4)	20.0 (-2.6)	23.4 (-1.5)	21.4 (-2.6)
Southridge	18.1 (-1.6)	20.4 (-.2)	18.3 (-.7)	20.1 (-.8)	19.4 (-.8)
Sunset	19.1 (-1.4)	21.1 (-.6)	19.4 (-.3)	20.8 (-1.3)	20.2 (-.9)
Westview	18.6 (-1.4)	20.7 (0)	19.2 (+.1)	20.9 (-.7)	20.0 (-.5)

Subject	Asian	Black	White	Hispanic	Multiracial
English	20.1 (-1.3)	14.8 (-1.5)	19.0 (-1.2)	14.6 (-1.1)	19.1 (-1.2)
Mathematics	23.3 (-.3)	15.9 (-1.0)	20.8 (+.1)	16.2 (-.3)	21.0 (-.1)
Reading	20.4 (+.2)	15.9 (0)	19.4 (-.1)	15.4 (-.1)	19.5 (0)
Science	22.7 (-.5)	17.5 (-.4)	20.7 (-.8)	17.4 (-.4)	20.9 (-.7)
Composite	21.7 (-.6)	16.2 (-.7)	20.1 (-.5)	16.0 (-.5)	20.2 (-.5)

Subject	Female	Male	Subject	SPED	ELL	TAG
English	18.6 (-1.0)	17.5 (-1.6)	English	13.0 (-1.3)	10.9 (-1.3)	23.7 (-1.5)
Mathematics	19.6 (0)	20.3 (-.4)	Mathematics	14.2 (-.6)	13.4 (-.7)	26.8 (-.2)
Reading	18.9 (+.1)	18.2 (-.4)	Reading	13.7 (-.5)	12.3 (-.5)	24.1 (0)
Science	19.9 (-.7)	20.3 (-.9)	Science	15.5 (-1.0)	14.8 (-.7)	25.7 (-1.1)
Composite	19.3 (-.5)	19.2 (-.9)	Composite	14.2 (-.9)	13.0 (-1.0)	25.2 (-.7)

Source: PLAN data disc

10th Grade Mean Plan Scores



CCR Math ACT 2014-15					
School	Yes		No		
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	
Aloha High	110	27.4%	291	72.6%	
Arts & Communicatio	33	44.6%	41	55.4%	
Beaverton High	158	41.7%	221	58.3%	
Community School	0	0.0%	52	100.0%	
Health & Science Scho	23	32.9%	47	67.1%	
ISB	53	70.7%	22	29.3%	
Science & Technology	26	86.7%	4	13.3%	
Southridge High	175	47.7%	192	52.3%	
Sunset High	272	60.4%	178	39.6%	
Westview High	295	50.9%	284	49.1%	
District	1145	46.2%	1333	53.8%	
	Yes		No		
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	
TAG	397	93.9%	26	6.1%	
SpEd	32	12.2%	231	87.8%	
ELL	7	12.1%	51	87.9%	
	Yes		No		
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	
Male	640	55.9%	630	47.3%	
Female	505	44.1%	703	52.7%	
Source: ACT disc					
CCR Math by ethnicity/race					
Subject	Asian	Black	White	Hispanic /Latino	Multiracial
Mathematics	70.5%	21.0%	51.6%	16.8%	52.2%

SYNOPSIS OF THE DATA RELATED TO MEASURING THE BSD STRATEGIC PLAN MEASURE COLLEGE-READINESS

To assess college-readiness:

- Students completing Oregon University System minimum entrance requirements (15 specified college-prep courses with C or better)

Note: Each item below refers to BSD 2014 Graduates. Approximately 15% of BSD students don't complete a diploma, modified diploma, GED, etc. and they are not included in the data.

1. 78% of BSD 2014 Graduates met OUS entrance requirements in Math.
2. The percentages of 2014 Graduates at BSD's five comprehensive High Schools meeting OUS math entrance requirements varied from 67% to 85%
3. The percentages of 2014 Graduates from BSD's five comprehensive High Schools **not** meeting OUS math entrance requirements varied from 4% to 21%. This means they did not take an Algebra II or Statistics class. The math course offerings to graduate allowed them to get three math credits, many of those credits with a letter grade of a D, in courses that are not preparing them for college level coursework.

Note: Approximately 27% of BSD 2014 graduates went to OUS Universities.

4. Of the BSD 2014 Graduates who enrolled in OUS Universities, slightly more than 15% were required to take a remedial (below 100 level) math class that does not provide them with college credit.
5. Of the BSD 2014 Graduates who enrolled in OUS Universities 29% of them did not take a math class as a freshman. There are various reasons for this.
6. The percentages at BSD's five comprehensive High Schools and Option schools meeting the ACT College and Career Readiness benchmark varies from 28% to 82% (excluding Community School).
 - The percentage of the ACT College and Career Readiness benchmark averages approximately 30 percentage points below the percentage meeting OUS math entrance requirements at each school.
 - For example at one high school, the percentage of 2014 Graduates meeting OUS Math entrance requirements was 73%, but only 54% met the ACT College and Career readiness benchmark as a junior, and this example is one of the lowest discrepancies.
 - Some students will increase their readiness through coursework as a senior, but many won't even take a math course as a senior.
 - This is comparing readiness at the junior level to the senior level, but there shouldn't be that much discrepancy.

Data related to measuring the BSD Strategic Plan Measure College-readiness.

To assess college-readiness:

- Students completing Oregon University System minimum entrance requirements (15 specified college-prep courses with C or better)
- Students earning nine or more college-level credits

1. The table below indicates the percentage of BSD Graduates meeting OUS Entrance Requirements.

School Name	2012-13	2013-14
Aloha High School	49%	53%
Arts & Communication Magnet Academy	68%	47%
Beaverton High School	46%	55%
Community School	5%	0%
Health & Science School	52%	50%
International School of Beaverton	82%	82%
School of Science & Technology	25%	76%
Southridge High School	65%	63%
Sunset High School	48%	60%
Westview High School	63%	75%

2. The table below indicates the percentage of BSD Graduates meeting OUS Entrance Requirements in five content areas.

By content area	2012-13	2013-14
English Language Arts	77%	79%
Social Science	72%	78%
Science	78%	78%
World Language	83%	81%
Mathematics	78%	78%

3. The table below indicates the percentage of students meeting OUS Entrance requirements for math. For BSD this means the percentage of students who completed 3 math classes with a C or better *including* an Algebra II and/or Statistics class.

School Name	2012-13	2013-14
Aloha High School	73%	72%
Arts & Communication Magnet Academy	86%	91%
Beaverton High School	74%	67%
Community School	32%	21%
Health & Science School	94%	82%
International School of Beaverton	90%	92%
School of Science & Technology	89%	94%
Southridge High School	80%	73%
Sunset High School	68%	72%
Westview High School	85%	85%

The next two tables indicate the percentage of students who are meeting our graduation requirements, but are not meeting OUS math requirements and are deemed not prepared for a college level math course because they have yet to successfully complete an Algebra 2 or equivalent course.

4. The table below indicates the percentage of graduates not meeting OUS Entrance requirements for math with three or more math credits *with a grade of C or better*, but do not have an Algebra II or a Statistics class with a grade of C or better.

School Name	2012-13	2013-14
Aloha High School	14%	6%
Arts & Communication Magnet Academy	0%	0%
Beaverton High School	3%	6%
Community School	40%	50%
Health & Science School	0%	3%
International School of Beaverton	0%	3%
School of Science & Technology	0%	6%
Southridge High School	6%	6%
Sunset High School	14%	12%
Westview High School	2%	1%

5. The table below indicates the percentage of graduates not meeting OUS Entrance requirements for math with three or more math credits (one or more classes may have been passed with a letter grade of D), but do not have an Algebra II or a Statistics class with a grade of C or better.

School Name	2012-13	2013-14
Aloha High School	21%	14%
Arts & Communication Magnet Academy	11%	7%
Beaverton High School	18%	19%
Community School	56%	67%
Health & Science School	4%	7%
International School of Beaverton	0%	3%
School of Science & Technology	4%	6%
Southridge High School	16%	19%
Sunset High School	24%	21%
Westview High School	8%	4%

Note: The students represented in Table 4 are also represented in Table 5. In other words, Table 4 represents all the students that met our math graduation requirements and did not meet OUS Math Entrance requirements who received C or better in three math courses, where Table 5 also includes the students who received at least one D in the three math courses. Table 3 and Table 5 together will indicate the percentage of students that met our math graduation requirements.

6. The table below compares the percentages of students meeting OUS entrance requirements to the percentage of students meeting the ACT College and Career Readiness Math Benchmark. BSD students take the ACT during their junior year, so they would potential have one plus years of math after taking the ACT.

School	Graduates Meeting OUS Entrance Requirements in Math	Grads Meeting ACT CCR Math Benchmark	Of grads who met OUS Math Requirement, % Met ACT CCR Math Benchmark	Of grads who did not meet OUS Math Requirement, % Met ACT CCR Math Benchmark
Aloha High School	72%	35%	46%	4%
Arts & Communication Magnet Academy	91%	36%	40%	
Beaverton High School	67%	48%	65%	8%
Community School	21%	0%		0%
Health & Science School	82%	28%	31%	
International School of Beaverton	92%	56%	59%	
School of Science & Technology	94%	82%	87%	
Southridge High School	73%	54%	70%	3%
Sunset High School	72%	55%	71%	12%
Westview High School	85%	61%	63%	11%

Notes for Table 6:

1. Cells with less than 10 students are not reported.
2. Graduates that do not have 4 ELA credits and 3 Social Studies credits in the Data Warehouse are excluded.
3. An example of how to relate percentages in the columns is described below.

To equate the percentage in column three (Grads Meeting ACT CCR Math Benchmark), first multiply the percentage in column 2 by the percentage in column 4. Then multiply the percentage in column 2 by the percentage in column 5. Those two results added together should be equal to the percentage in column 3 with just some slight rounding error.

For example for Aloha High School, Column 2 times Column 4 is $.72 * .46 = .3312$ and $.72 * .04 = .0288$. Those two decimals added, $.3312 + .0288 = .36$. Since the original percentages are rounded to the nearest percent, the final sum might be off by one percent.

7. Oregon University System: High School Transition Entering Freshman Profile

Math Highlights for Class of 2012	Count	GPA
Number of BSD High School Graduates	2425	
Number of BSD High School Graduates entering OUS as Freshman	650	3.06
Number of BSD High School Graduates taking a math class as Freshmen	461	2.93
Number of BSD HS Graduates whose first math class is remedial	70	2.65
Number of BSD HS Graduates whose first math class is College Algebra	185	2.91
Number of BSD HS Graduates whose first math class is Pre-Calculus	60	2.74
Number of BSD HS Graduates whose first math class is Calculus	87	3.01
Number of BSD HS Graduates whose first math class is beyond Calculus	28	3.58
Number of BSD HS Graduates whose first math class is another 100 level or above course not in the categories above.	31	

Notes for BSD Class of 2012

71% of BSD Graduates who attend a University in the OUS take a math class as a freshman.

Of those taking a math class as a freshman...

15.2% took a remedial math class (below 100 level)

40.1% took a College Algebra class

13.0% took a Pre-Calculus class

18.9% took a Calculus class

6.1% took a class beyond Calculus

6.7% took a 100 level or above course not in the categories listed above.

2014-15	Graduation rate 4yr cohort		
School			
Aloha High School	74.78		
Arts and Communication Magnet Acaden	94.12		
Beaverton High School	73.85		
Community School	34.95		
Health & Science School	84.62		
International School of Beaverton	98.72		
School of Science & Technology	81.08		
Southridge High School	89.63		
Sunset High School	89.19		
Westview High School	84.25		
District	81.30		
<i>Source: ODE</i>			
Students Completing 3+ College Level Courses	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
All Students		49.80%	52.80%
Male		45.60%	48.20%
Female		54.10%	57.80%
Econ. Disadvantaged		33.50%	35.50%
ELL		19.20%	13.50%
Student with Disabilities		15.20%	11.80%
TAG		87.30%	86.50%
Asian		75.50%	77.20%
Pacific Islander*		13.00%	23.80%
Black		34.30%	30.00%
Hispanic		29.50%	29.00%
American Indian/Alaskan Native*		14.30%	36.40%
White		52.60%	57.10%
Multi-Racial		46.20%	58.70%
School Name	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Aloha High School		47.80%	48.30%
Arts & Communication Magnet Academy		27.60%	24.30%
Beaverton High School		51.20%	52.60%
Community School		11.80%	6.20%
Health & Science School		56.10%	64.00%
International School of Beaverton		98.60%	100.00%
School of Science & Technology		72.70%	65.10%
Southridge High School		51.00%	48.40%
Sunset High School		47.30%	55.40%

Westview High School		51.30%	59.40%
* Interpret with caution: Less than 30 in group			
2014-15	Graduation (Standard Diploma) by Math Essential Skills		
School	OAKS	WS	Other Test
Aloha High School	315	113	6
Arts and Communication Magnet Acaden	73	10	
Beaverton High School	328	45	
Community School	25	24	3
Health & Science School	29	14	
International School of Beaverton	72	2	3
School of Science & Technology	30	1	
Southridge High School	368	14	12
Sunset High School	426	53	4
Westview High School	437	67	16
District	2103	343	44
Source: Synergy			
Graduates Meeting OUS Entrance Requirements			
Beaverton School District	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
All Students	55.50%	60.30%	59.00%
Male	50.10%	55.90%	56.40%
Female	61.30%	64.60%	61.40%
Econ. Disadvantaged	32.80%	34.40%	33.90%
ELL *	11.10%	4.20%	0.00%
Student with Disabilities	17.30%	11.90%	14.50%
TAG	84.50%	85.20%	85.10%
Asian	74.20%	75.90%	78.90%
Pacific Islander*	22.20%	25.00%	66.70%
Black	33.30%	40.50%	37.20%
Hispanic	33.30%	30.40%	31.40%
American Indian/Alaskan Native*	33.30%	14.30%	55.60%
White	57.50%	65.10%	62.60%
Multi-Racial	51.70%	61.20%	57.60%

School Name	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Aloha High School	49.00%	52.50%	50.30%
Arts & Communication Magnet Academy	68.20%	46.60%	59.50%
Beaverton High School	45.70%	55.10%	53.10%
Community School	5.30%	0.00%	4.40%
Health & Science School	52.20%	50.00%	73.00%
International School of Beaverton	81.90%	82.40%	73.00%
School of Science & Technology	25.00%	75.80%	93.30%
Southridge High School	65.40%	63.00%	52.10%
Sunset High School	48.00%	60.40%	71.90%
Westview High School	63.30%	75.10%	63.00%
<i>* Interpret with caution: Less than 30 in group</i>			
By content area	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
English Language Arts	77%	79%	77%
Social Science	72%	78%	78%
Science	78%	78%	78%
World Language	83%	81%	85%
Mathematics	78%	78%	79%
Beaverton School District	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Male	59%	60%	64%
Female	51%	52%	54%
Econ. Disadvantaged	46%	48%	51%
ELL	24%	21%	15%
SpEd	36%	43%	41%
TAG	61%	59%	57%
Asian	56%	58%	60%
Pacific Islander*	64%	33%	57%
Black	52%	47%	53%
Hispanic	43%	45%	50%
American Indian/Alaskan Native*	38%	60%	55%
White	58%	59%	62%
Arts & Communication Magnet Academy	89%	88%	88%
Beaverton High School	62%	56%	59%
Community School	32%	29%	32%
Health & Science School	68%	88%	95%
International School of Beaverton	26%	0%	0%
School of Science & Technology	10%	11%	17%
Southridge High School	46%	53%	63%
Sunset High School	61%	62%	58%
Westview High School	55%	67%	70%
<i>Source: Strategic Plan for the School Board</i>			
<i>*Note: groups of 30 or fewer are not reported.</i>			


535 responses

Summary

How many years have you been teaching? (whole number, include this year)

1-40 years

How confident are you teaching math?




Not Confident: 1 **1** 0.2%

2 **55** 10.3%

3 **285** 53.3%


Very Confident: 4 **194** 36.3%

How much time do your students spend learning math each day?




Less than 60 minutes	71	13.3%
61-75 minutes	302	56.4%
76-90 minutes	145	27.1%
More than 90 minutes	17	3.2%

Eureka/Engage NY [How often do you use these resources for math instruction?]




Never	37	6.9%
Rarely	22	4.1%
Sometimes	44	8.2%
Regularly	432	80.7%

Everyday Math [How often do you use these resources for math instruction?]




Supplemental Resources (Web or workbooks) [How often do you use these resources for math instruction?]



Never	46	8.6%
Rarely	83	15.5%
Sometimes	271	50.7%
Regularly	135	25.2%


TeacherSource [How often do you use these resources for math instruction?]



Never	217	40.6%
Rarely	174	32.5%
Sometimes	114	21.3%
Regularly	30	5.6%


Online Practice (e.g. Frontrow, Kahn, Tenmarks) [How often do you use these

resources for math instruction?]




Never	239	44.7%
Rarely	85	15.9%
Sometimes	134	25%
Regularly	77	14.4%

Does your grade level team ability group (or level) students for math instruction?




No	238	44.5%
Some ability grouping within classrooms	140	26.2%
Consistent ability grouping within classrooms	38	7.1%
Ability grouping (e.g. Walk to Math) between classrooms	119	22.2%

For what grade(s) do you teach math? Check all that apply.




Do you teach math using a workshop (whole-small group, conferring) model?




No	199	37.2%
Yes	115	21.5%
Sometimes	221	41.3%

PD

Sub release [How would you prefer to access Professional Development?]




Online collaborations or courses for PDUs [How would you prefer to access Professional Development?]




Don't like	216	40.4%
It's not my favorite	179	33.5%
This is fine	117	21.9%
I like it and want more of it	23	4.3%

Extended contract (after school) [How would you prefer to access Professional Development?]




Don't like	101	18.9%
It's not my favorite	135	25.2%
This is fine	215	40.2%
I like it and want more of it	84	15.7%

Extended contract (August) [How would you prefer to access Professional Development?]




Don't like	104	19.4%
It's not my favorite	78	14.6%
This is fine	225	42.1%
I like it and want more of it	128	23.9%

Extended contract (online courses) [How would you prefer to access Professional Development?]




Don't like	178	33.3%
It's not my favorite	125	23.4%
This is fine	170	31.8%
I like it and want more of it	62	11.6%

Common Core State Standards Knowledge [What Professional Development do you need?]




8 Mathematical Practices [What Professional Development do you need?]




Don't need it	116	21.7%
A little	170	31.8%
Sure	199	37.2%
Definitely	50	9.3%

Planning instruction for all learners [What Professional Development do you need?]




Don't need it	57	10.7%
A little	91	17%
Sure	233	43.6%
Definitely	154	28.8%

Structures for math instruction (e.g. Workshop, etc.) [What Professional Development do you need?]




Don't need it	64	12%
A little	103	19.3%
Sure	219	40.9%
Definitely	149	27.9%

Inquiry-based instruction [What Professional Development do you need?]



Don't need it	67	12.5%
A little	102	19.1%
Sure	234	43.7%
Definitely	132	24.7%


Moderation/Calibration [What Professional Development do you need?]



Don't need it	97	18.1%
A little	171	32%


Sure	208	38.9%
Definitely	59	11%

I am confident that a score of "3" is consistently applied across the district.



Strongly Disagree: 1	126	23.6%
2	262	49%
3	137	25.6%
Strongly Agree: 4	10	1.9%


Have you used Eureka/Engage New York?



No	29	5.4%
In the past	41	7.7%
Currently using	465	86.9%


Eureka/Engage NY

How many years have you used Eureka/Engage NY?




Less than 1 year	193	38.1%
1+ years	217	42.9%
2+ years	96	19%

Problem Sets [What components of Eureka/Engage NY do you currently use?]




Not at all	21	4.2%
Somewhat	45	8.9%
Mostly	107	21.1%
Fully	333	65.8%

Homework [What components of Eureka/Engage NY do you currently use?]




Not at all	72	14.2%
Somewhat	70	13.8%
Mostly	97	19.2%
Fully	267	52.8%

Exit Tickets [What components of Eureka/Engage NY do you currently use?]




Not at all	70	13.8%
Somewhat	148	29.2%
Mostly	99	19.6%
Fully	189	37.4%

Module Assessments [What components of Eureka/Engage NY do you currently use?]




Not at all	63	12.5%
Somewhat	95	18.8%
Mostly	106	20.9%
Fully	242	47.8%

Sprints/Fluency [What components of Eureka/Engage NY do you currently use?]




I have attended a Eureka/Engage NY Math Module Overviews



Never heard of them	48	9.5%
No	183	36.2%
Just one	138	27.3%
Two or more	137	27.1%


I need more training with the Eureka/Engage NY curriculum.



Nope, I'm good	193	38.1%
Some videos might help	142	28.1%


I need sit-down PD	101	20%
I need a wide range of training	70	13.8%

How have you used the Eureka/Engage NY lesson and homework videos?




Wait, what videos?	179	35.4%
I've looked at a few myself	133	26.3%
I've only used them in class	17	3.4%
I've shared them with parents	126	24.9%
I've shared them with parents and used them in class	51	10.1%

Points and Percentages [I primarily score math using]



Never	171	33.8%
Sometimes	140	27.7%
Often	120	23.7%
All the time	75	14.8%


Eureka/Engage NY Rubrics [I primarily score math using]



Never	196	38.7%
Sometimes	136	26.9%


Often	109	21.5%
All the time	65	12.8%

Beaverton aligned Eureka/Engage NY Rubrics [I primarily score math using]




Never	191	37.7%
Sometimes	123	24.3%
Often	131	25.9%
All the time	61	12.1%

Beaverton Math Rubric [I primarily score math using]




Never	203	40.1%
Sometimes	143	28.3%
Often	99	19.6%
All the time	61	12.1%

I have accessed Eureka/Engage NY materials and supplements on TeacherSource.




Ordering Eureka/Engage NY materials from Documart is easy (if applicable)



Strongly Disagree: 1	75	17.2%
2	110	25.2%
3	160	36.6%
Strongly Agree: 4	92	21.1%


I have found effective methods for organizing Eureka/Engage NY materials.



Strongly Disagree: 1	57	11.3%
2	144	28.5%

	3	197	38.9%
Strongly Agree: 4	108	21.3%	


Eureka/Engage NY materials are effective at teaching the standards.



Strongly Disagree: 1	36	7.1%
2	106	20.9%
3	228	45.1%
Strongly Agree: 4	136	26.9%

Suggestions

Eureka/Engage NY should be considered as part of the next adoption cycle.



Strongly Disagree: 1	82	15.3%
2	107	20%
3	158	29.5%
Strongly Agree: 4	188	35.1%

What other math programs should be considered for adoption? (Optional)

Bridges

Bridges

number sense

I think Eureka/Engage NY is the strongest.

Edm if aligned to ccss.

A math program that uses more hands on manipulative and one that the assessment does not need to be modified.

ALEKS online math program, its great for extra support.

A less worksheet driven program and more developmentally appropriate materials for kindergarten math. A program with less material/instructions to read for each lesson.

Please don't make us change yet again. Our students need consistency, something that works and something that meets the standards. Low income students are hurt the most during adoption changes because they desperately need the consistency of a curriculum. Especially the consistency of engage New York, which has vocabulary that has taken my fifth graders two years to learn, but they know it better than any of my previously classes.

Before I'd recommend that, I'd like to see or learn more about Beaverton's view on Math workshop, strategies for creating inquiry and hands on learning opportunities with Engage NY and what supports could be provided. For some lessons, ALOT of prep is involved gathering materials or cutting them out. Especially at the younger grades as I taught secondary last year, primary this year. How can the district support with these thing?

I had an opportunity through SV to attend a workshop through Jonathan Brendefur via Boise State and the EL network. What I learned from this experience was what to teach and when, and an in-depth look at the 8 mathematical thinking components. Through this lens, I learned an 'sequence' to provide instruction with an emphasis on problem solving. It was not "one program". It was an application of standards. That experience changed not only my instructional approach, but my students' math knowledge and progress. (Yes, I know this, because I was with the same students.) Since adopting what I learned from him, my students' math skills (strategies and communication) have soared! I don't think it always about the "program", as sometimes we can get stuck on teaching a 'program' from page 1 to page ---, and the teaching the 'kids' part can get diluted. Jonathan provided an overview of WHY and WHEN. Yes, programs provide a foundation and a place to begin, especially for new teachers. However, the research based methods/approach that I learned from Jonathan has made the most difference in my student progress.

We need a math adoption that is already leveled for us. Especially for PYP schools or schools working to be PYP as we aren't allowed to ability group and walk to math in PYP. There has to be some type of a program providing homework and classwork and instruction options for small groups that is already leveled. Engage NY is not sped or ESL friendly. It's 6-7 pages per lesson for the teacher are NOT teacher friendly. It's approach is

often confusing and way too abstract for struggling learners which is half of my students. Engage NY has too much of an emphasis on story problems and not enough on the skills/objectives/targets we need our kids to understand. The story problems are so confusing and complicated, they often stump teachers.

Overall I think Engage NY is a great program. It's not perfect, and I don't use all of the materials. I wish that "ADOPTIONS" would consider using a variety of materials. It feels like we "throw the baby out with the bath water" every time we adopt a new curriculum. What if we KEEP the REALLY good parts and supplement with other things? This would also cut down on PD because we're not starting from scratch EVERY time. Are you looking for a one size fits all program? I have some sad news . . . there isn't one! Let's just work on gathering some really great lessons from wherever we can find them.

Shannon McCaw's 6th grade curriculum is great, but I have not tried the 5th grade materials. Basically I want a program that has learning materials (books, etc so students can reference what we are learning). I also want one with more scaffolding. The Engage NY methods are so obscure that even my TAG students struggle with it. I would love it if the materials included pre assessments, differentiated homework and assignments and a practical approach to how much time we have to teach math before testing. Engage NY is too long and there is no hope of finishing it before testing. It is not fair for the kids to sit down and test when they have not seen 2 modules. As a result I greatly modify the materials and will likely use them far less often next year. Please adopt a curriculum other than Engage NY!! :)

Excel

Anything but ENY. My students don't understand the method of learning. My parents dislike it very much. Even a parent who is an accountant told me they didn't understand and were unable to help their child. My students really dislike math time. ENY is too much paper and pencil and not enough hands on. Even the few hands on parts we can't do because the district has not supplied the materials. I just can't afford to keep buying what my class needs.

I think a separate adoption for kindergarten should be considered, however, however, I do not have a particular program to suggest. I just think kindergarten is such a unique year in so many ways.

I believe that we should go to a standard based system. I think the district should invest in quality manipulatives, games and technology programs. There should be PD provided for backward design and standards based teaching. There needs to be alignment across the district for grade levels and vertical alignment. We need time to collaborate with our colleagues and strong leaders to guide our collaboration. The PD and rollout of a program like this would need to be stronger and more organized the reading rollout this year because many teachers do not feel as comfortable teaching math and they do reading and writing.

Any program that varies instruction more than Eureka/Engage NY. The format lends itself

to too much whole group direct instruction.

I liked Everyday Math too.

Not sure, but I would like to say that I LOVE Engage NY and am so glad to be using it this year. It's been the best part of my school year! My students have shown incredible growth and have a deep understanding of place value. Out of a class of 30 students, I can confidently say that 29 of them have made progress and deepened their understanding of 2nd grade concepts. I could never have said that about Everyday Math or Investigations. PLEASE consider Engage NY as part of the next adoption cycle.

I think Engage should be the main consideration. Having had a 'soft switch' in curriculum (not during an adoption cycle, but really forced to move into Engage from Everyday) really already constitutes an adoption change from my perspective. The fact that we could have it going on for just a couple of years, and then be asked to change again is upsetting. No one adoption will be loved by everyone, and I understand a committee making decisions based on a close examination. However, changing things over and over is also not good for students. Please let us stick with Engage for some time, with the freedom to monitor and adjust as professionals.

Any special education materials. Look at hands on options.

I've invested myself in the use of EngageNY/Eureka math. After using it the past two years at two grade levels, I feel there are many problems with the program. Some concepts are presented in a haphazard manner, large leaps in what is expected of students are taken (sometimes even within a single day), students are not given near enough practice with new or difficult concepts in order to develop mastery, there is not enough revisiting of concepts built into the program. Frankly... I liked the pacing, support materials and structure of Everyday Math.

Eureka Math is a good program and my first graders do know their math facts and strategies more than ever before. I struggle with the speed/pace of the program and how long the lessons are. It needs more game components built into the program. (I supplement with games from old programs and online resource) It needs all of the teaching materials supplied instead of having to make them. The masters for student cards don't line up back to back - making more work.

I do not know of any other math programs that actually teach the targets however I think we really need to look for a program that is similar to Engage in that it speaks to the targets and challenges our students. However, we need resources for our language deprived and language learning students.

I have no idea, for the most part I like ENY but for the life of me I cannot get through the entire lesson in the time they suggest, so I end up cutting out great things :(

Envision Math (Pearson)

McGraw-Hill used to be a very good math program - not sure how it looks updated for common core.

It would be nice if self-contained special education teachers were able to access a math

curriculum that is geared toward our learners. I've tried to use Engage NY but for my students, who have ASD and are intellectually disabled, it's too difficult.

Supplemental materials that offer practice and repetition for students to master skills

A consistent fluency practice program. Something like Rocket Math that doesn't waste as much paper.

I have been using Deanna Jump's curriculum purchased from teachers pay teachers. I like it. I've also been doing the Christina Tondevold (?) free number sense videos.

Anything from her seems wonderful!

NOT Everyday Math

It would be extremely disappointing to not move forward with Engage NY after investing so much time/energy in a resource that is aligned with the CCSS.

At this point teachers across the district have learned Engage NY/Eureka---don't change it on us again!!! My kids have made HUGE progress.

Everyday Math is far more beneficial as far as pacing and hitting the CC standards. It is also more intuitive in my ability to deliver accurate instruction. EM also delivers all materials/provides materials without me having to scramble around looking for 1000 straws for a lesson.

I'm not familiar with other possible programs, but like the Van de Walle approach (Teaching Student-Centered Mathematics), problem-solving based and feel that we need a program with embedded differentiation practices, as opposed to the current movement in our building towards standardized instruction, same pacing from class to class, same everything. There is very little interactive in ENY, very few games, no vocabulary development time, too little practice opportunities. This program is too teacher-centered and not developmentally appropriate. It also stresses the directed use of specific strategies too often, as opposed to having students choose a strategy.

Inquiry-based curriculums!

Math Expressions!!!!!! MATH EXPRESSIONS

I wish EDM was more popular; I think it is valuable!

Bridges for primary grades. A revised more user friendly and easier to read Eureka. A cadre could work on designing more appropriate and easier to read homework and problem sets.

I would be very disappointed if we adopted anything other the Eureka/Engage NY. I push in for ESL, so I have taught most of the lessons 5 times or so. I am very impressed with how is scaffolds the concepts and the language. I have noticed that many elementary teachers are not super comfortable teaching math, and therefor have a hard time with any new program. Engage New York is very worksheet heavy and students get worksheet burnout. I think many teachers need time and ideas on how to teach the lesson/concept, but not actually use the worksheet. I also think teachers need ideas on how to structure their day. For example, some teachers want their students to finish every worksheet every day and do the exit slip, all in about 70 minutes. Not possible. I think there needs to be a

lot of discussion about daily routine and adding in more engaging and hands on activities. We are already doing Engage NY, why we would want to change it? This is our second year doing it. It's not perfect but nothing is perfect. But it gets better when you keep teaching it for a few years.

I'm not sure- but I've been exploring some inquiry materials and trying to find ways to make things truly hands on and exploring without losing solid practice. I have been making my own binders to work through the targets that use EngageNY as a great practice- but are interwoven with more interactive activities. I don't know if anything out there exists that has this work already done.... I think what I would love is more time to take what we have and develop it into true inquiry. (Thanks for reading this round about answer)

This program lacks any differentiation for all learners. The instruction sets are whole group based. Concerns: lack of differentiation, instruction is whole group based, where is the small group instruction When we meet with PD module groups, why are they removing so many lessons, are they not appropriate? Why tear something apart if they don't like the whole thing. What are our other choices?? Something with lots of differentiation!!!

Online resources such as ALEKS

DeeDee Wills and Deanna Jump Guiding Kinders Math Workshop- Math Resources from Teacher Pay Teacher The same concepts as Engaged NY. I like it because it is more appealing to kindergarten learners and presented in a friendly format for beginning learners.

Math Their Way is an older program but it has been VERY successful for kindergartners. It gives the kids a strong base in number concepts and can be run like reading centers. It allows the teacher to move around the room and work with students at their specific levels. Teachers would need some MAKE & TAKE trainings.

Guiding Kinders by Deanna Jump and Deedee Wills This program is Common Core aligned and follows Engage New York, but is more kid friendly and engaging. My current students are learning at a very fast pace and really enjoy the program.

Not sure... As a sped/resource room teacher, I feel (and hear from many other learning specialists and ESL teachers) that engage NY is way too language loaded. Many teachers have told me that they are not using most of the components of the program because of the heavy language/reading involved. Other, more simplified programs might be better.

I'm fine with ENY

I'm not really sure. I just know that Engage NY/Eureka Math is SO dry. I find while it has some good teaching ideas, a lot of it is counter productive to student learning.

If we adopt Eureka/Engage NY, we need more of the manipulatives. I am scrambling to find the manipulatives.

Something with more differentiation options!

Everyday Math - it works perfect for second grade

I don't have a problem with Eureka per se, but if we do consider it an adoption, I have several things that would make it more user friendly... such as making the answer keys (the small versions that they have for the problem sets that are super tiny) full page and have not just the answer, but the steps that got them there. There are no answer keys / student examples for the exit tickets or homework.

A program that takes in account the reading level of first grade students. Many students can't read the REALLY wordy problems, directions and assessments in Engage NY. A program that focuses on math not reading. Also, a program that has a lot of practice opportunities, is straight forward, had differentiation opportunities, has a text book and a teacher book.

Supplemental material for Math intervention. Hands on Math, Aleks, Moby Max etc... Have we ever considered using Bridges? I like the games and interactions. Engage seems to be so teacher driven and worksheet happy.

Something that is not as boring as Eureka Math. The program is solid, but it absolutely squelches the joy and wonder out of math for the kids. Other thing: there are parts of 3 different math programs in my room I have no idea what to keep and what to pass out because I don't know what could be useful with the new math adoption. Our stairwell is full of math and reading materials that are boxed, ready from someone to pick them up and move them on, and have been for the past year. I've seen math manipulatives in the garbage when a new math adoption is put in and don't want to be in the scenario where I pass something on, only to find my district having to order essentially the same things the next year. We have many new teachers in Beaverton and also many teachers changing grade levels. Could we put together a grade-by grade list of what materials should be saved in a classroom, what should be moved along, what should stay at a school for occasional, community use, etc.?

Something that is able to be more differentiated. ENGAGE is a one-size fits all. Also, the manipulatives portion is weak. First graders need concrete experiences.

None, Everyday Math meets the needs of my students, although we do add number bonds and ten frames on a regular basis because it's the only thing from Engage NY that my team and I find valuable.

I do like the ENY/Eureka, one thing that I have loved about it, but has also been a difficulty is the rigor. There is a lot of it, which makes the work for more of the on level or above level students. The focus for me is making it accessible to my lower students. Where as curriculums in the past were less rigorous and easier to fit with each student, and the focus then was how to get those kids to higher levels who were ready. So I'm seeing that the focus has seemed to switch.

One of the programs that includes reteach and enrichment practice sheets.

As a first year teacher, I am not familiar with many models of teaching mathematics.

I am not really sure, but I feel that there has to be some sort of curriculum that still

incorporates the rigor of common core, but also makes it easier to differentiate for the lower mathematicians. I find myself constantly having to recreate lessons, problem sets, module assessments to meet the needs of my students. I know many other teachers around the district are doing the same thing, it's very frustrating.

I think a program that deals with number sense such as the video course taught by Christina Tondevold is super important for younger students. I wish the district would provide her online course for teachers grades K-2. www.MathematicallyMinded.com
www.TheRecoveringTraditionalist.com

I have heard Georgia math is good, but I have not used it.

I don't think it's age appropriate. I think using Christina Tondevold's developing number sense methods in K-2 would go a long way towards getting our kids ready for 3rd grade and beyond math.

Additional resources are needed to develop fact fluency. While Eureka Math has this as daily practice, it is still not enough for many children.

Something with a book, and teacher's guide. Common assessments that align with report cards-district wide

I would consider Bridges Math with all its components or Everyday Math. I am using ENY more as a supplemental to Everyday Math but feel ENY it is over abundant in teacher direct teaching and not enough engagement in practicing skills for K-2.

No comment

?

Bridges!!! Bridges seems much more engaging than Eureka/Engage NY and more approachable for a variety of learners. Engage NY is very dry and repetitive and hard for struggling learners to access. It is not hands-on or inquiry based. It includes whole-class lessons that are much too long. I am not enjoying teaching math with Engage NY.

I would like to see more inquiry methods along with Engage NY.

Not that familiar w/other programs.

I miss Everyday Math. That was my favorite.

Everyday Math

programs that address the needs below.

I wish had the answer! I will say that I am extremely dissatisfied with Eureka Math as a teacher and as a parent in the district for multiple reasons. I truly believe it is poorly written and does not provide a wide range of activities for multi-abilities within one classroom. The struggling student is frustrated, the TAG students are bored and our on grade level students are frequently confused with the Eureka way of explaining. In addition, the amount of homework is ridiculous! I hope the district goes with a different choice. There must be a better option out there.

Any math program that would focus on the number sense and basic math skills that our students DO NOT enter school with. Our first graders are not prepared to access ENY. It

has been an exercise in extreme frustration and very time consuming to redo every lesson in order for the student to access the content.

Number sense by Christine Tuvold (spelling). These are the foundational skills our kids need. These are where the kids are at. Engage NY is developed for other kids at other levels of proficiency.

ORIGO Education Stepping Stones

It is too paper/pencil driven for early childhood learners. In addition, it is VERY TEACHER UNFRIENDLY. I do not like the way it is so dry and do not feel it is developmentally appropriate for the children. The amount of teacher prep and materials needed for 1 lesson was not appropriate. I did not feel that my students were any better prepared for assessments than using Everyday Math, which was much more teacher friendly and child-centered. I do not like it.

I'm not sure. I teach K and I don't think Engage NY has enough fun-games, hands on activities to teach content. I supplement a lot with EveryDay Math and other materials that are more fun and engaging to students. Too much paper and pencil math for kinders!

Would like to know what else is out there? Eureka Math does need to be modified for struggling Math Learners. If there is a math program that is better for those students, then I am open to it as well.

Bridges!!

Don't know what's out there.

I don't have another suggestion, but the "worksheet" components were not very developmental for kindergartners at the beginning of the year.

Houghton Mifflin. Engage NY is lacking in graphics, has poor page lay out, and somewhat poor presentation. I would like to see a math curriculum with better presentation of skills, a more kid-friendly page lay out, and a better spread of skills. Many times it lacks in simple practice and jumps to more complex skills.

needs more scaffolding for those students who don't have the previous year's skills or have very low skills

I think the common core state standards should be the focus and materials (like EngageNY, math racks, center games, etc) should support our teaching.

I am not sure what is out there, but feel that Engage NY is heavy on reading and writing and doesn't always make clear the math knowledge of a student. We need a program with computation and application represented in all areas: teaching, practice and assessment. It is also good to have skills spiral around again for ongoing practice and assessment.

I feel very strongly to have our district looking at Bridges Math curriculum second edition. They have a wonderful Number Corner curriculum that I have used in 1st grade and 3rd grade. It is really best to use along with the whole curriculum. This math program is kid friendly and that's where Eureka/Engage NY is lacking a lot!!!

I believe that Engage NY can be a good program to use. However, it is not developmentally appropriate for kindergarten. I find that most of my kindergartners are not ready to fill out all the worksheets and packets. Parents do not understand what we are teaching.

Is there a workshop model program for math?

Rocket Math

Opening Eyes to Mathematics Marcy Cook Materials, such as Arithmetwists

There should be more supplemental materials, because many of the lessons are too difficult for the students and take more time that allotted to teach.

Engage NY is okay, but some Modules ARE TOO LONG! Some modules are 30 lessons, which is RIDICULOUS! Back to Basics is fine--that is why I liked a lot of what Everyday Math offered. I would like to see a balanced program that offers what we are required to teach and assess in a way that we don't get stuck on one or two standards for weeks and weeks and weeks.

I don't like programs. I'd like to follow the ELA adoption with a resources & PD focus.

Something similar to what was done for the ELA adoption (mix of resources).

Engage NY - if it is adopted, the materials for the young ones need to be provided, pacing discussed and additional supports added. Not really aware of what is being looked at so this is difficult to discuss.

Eureka math sounds great for the upper grades, but for kindergarten I feel that it is not developmentally appropriate. Too many worksheets! Our team found that we were much more successful using Everyday Math and supplementing it with other math games and kindergarten appropriate worksheets found on our own. We are able to meet and exceed the standards using this model. Perhaps the district could adopt eureka for the older grades, and do something else to support kindergarten?

Not sure- but I find that it is hard having the teen numbers so late in the year. I think the modules should be swapped up and there is a need for a more instruction on how to modify for higher level kids, especially in the beginning.

I would like the focus to be less on a program adoption and more on how to teach math appropriately. I moved from Idaho which has required all teachers to take a math teaching course to learn new approaches and strategies for teaching Math. I found this the most valuable PD I have ever received and changed my views on Math instruction. It's not necessarily what program we teach that makes effective practice, it is how we teach what we need to teach! Teachers rely on Engage NY and other programs to follow what they think is the way to teach math concepts but teachers need to be taught actual skills for teaching this concepts. Following scripts is not as beneficial as having the actual knowledge to create your own script. I would highly recommend looking into Idaho's required Math courses and the outcome they have had with this and duplicating something similar.

I'm not sure. While I like how it aligns to CC, it is extremely cumbersome and prep

intensive (especially at lower grades). The homework is overly intense and I have spent most of the year fielding parent complaints. The reinventing of the wheel with all the vocabulary (ex: number bonds= fact triangle) is exhausting. I've created a vocab cheat sheet for my parents. I appreciate the rigor, but there is no way to finish it in a year and that means many skills from the previous year have been left out, which leaves it to the next year's teacher to "catch up".

Engage NY seems good on the whole, and if we use it next year, having been through one year with it, I will be even more effective with teaching it. I like the camaraderie and sharing of the monthly gatherings at Hazeldale and I would like to participate next year as well if that continues so I can refine my practice. I would like to know of other math programs being considered as the search for the best program is explored. I have taught Bridges and mostly Investigations in the past. I have participated in the Math Best Practices course as well. I have not had a lot of time to look at EveryDay Math and to see if it is a good supplement to Engage NY....that would be interesting to learn more about.....

I don't have any idea what's out there. I like that Engage really teaches the standards and explicitly teaches a variety of strategies and also helps young kids develop number sense. But it is totally whole group (as written), has too much teacher talk, and is not hands-on enough for first grade. If there's something that would fit more easily into a workshop model and used more manipulatives and games while still teaching the standards I would love it. Anything that's a little more first grade friendly would be great! What I like about EurekaMath, the rigor and challenge, along with exposing kids to appropriate math language, is also it's downfall. Kids are getting very frustrated that the language and rigor is so tough. Teachers manage as best they can with the material, but it is intense at times and really hits on the confidence of some struggling kids. With all of that being said, I would love Beaverton to look at math programs that can bring games, or manipulatives, or more supplemental materials that can provide more engagement with the kids.

Deanna Jump from TeachersPayTeachers for primary grades. We used EngageNY last year and it was a very frustrating experience. This year we have aligned Deanna Jump with our EngageNY resources to make sure all concepts are covered and our students have found way more success than when we only used EngageNY.

I really like Eureka math, now that I know how to teach it. Please don't take it away. :-)

I really like the thought and effort that went into Eureka Math in terms of sequence and strategy instruction (number bonds, tape diagrams, read-draw-write). It is very language based and time consuming. Hard for low readers and ELL. It wears young learners out. No games...minimal manipulatives, small print...no open-ended hands-on exploration and discovery. I would like to see a visually based extension or parallel component like ST Math, an online subscription program, that would allow for self paced concept pre-teaching in a game format (visual) prior to Eureka lessons. It would also utilize the Chromebooks that are coming and allow for active, independent math engagement while

teachers worked with small ability groups. Not cheap, but always going for the free online extensions has limitations with regard to tracking growth and individualized instruction. Would be nice for the district to pony up the \$\$\$\$ for something beneficial for all and not have individual schools negotiate for PTO funds. We seem to be all about the tool...but not the applications these days.

I've heard of Bridges being used at a local private school in Lake Oswego. The small portion of the curriculum I saw looked pretty rigorous.

Either I need training on using Eureka or I would like a program with more differentiation. I also like to use more games to teach to skills.

None

My main concern with ENY is that a new concept is taught basically everyday. There is little cycling back and review/reteaching of past skills. I worry that my students learn a concept and then quickly move on to something else and never see that concept again until state testing. I would appreciate an adoption that had more of a review or reteaching component- I know Everyday Math has the Math Boxes, which provide some review.

Another concern I have is that the tests do not seem to match the practice. They are ridiculously hard and almost seem to try and trick students. To me, this discourages them and also does not always provide me with the information about whether or not students understand a concept. I often find myself supplementing tests with basic skill pages to ensure that I know whether my students don't understand the skill or don't understand the convoluted word problem.

Use the CCSS Worksheets as practice, homework, challenge materials

EnVision Math Common Core

Everyday Math - I like this program. I think that Engage NY has definitely raised the bar.

Bridges: it is hands-on, uses games to engage kids. Allows for flexible groups and differentiation.

Something where the teachers actually receive formal training and are not self-taught relying on videos

GoMath

If we keep changing adoptions no one will ever get comfortable and fluent at teaching it. We need to stick with something instead of keeping throwing out the baby with the bath water.

Although it's a lot of prep work, I've really enjoyed using Bridges in the past, and believe it is now CCSS-aligned. Our school currently used the calendar component, Number Corner, and it is amazing! It's more hands-on, engaging and differentiated than ENY, yet supports CCSS.

none

Since I am not a curriculum person. I am not sure what programs are CCSS aligned. I have used Bridges in the past and it was a good program. I feel Eureka/engage NY

program is too lecture based. I feel that in K, at least we should be focused on early numeracy and making sure children are solid--as we learned from Christina Tonevold. We are jumping to facts and, even worse, fluency before children are ready. I think this district is confusing program and standards with curriculum. We need a comprehensive K-12 curriculum

ENY is the closest thing I have seen thus far to meeting the standards. It provides good rigor and lessons are set up nicely (review, application, whole group, independent work). However, it is often VERY difficult to understand for my ELLs and strategic students, and takes WAY longer than the intended amount of time. This program would be great at a non-title 1 school, but I wonder if there is something better out there. It lacks in games and engaging material. I often use pieces of the lessons but supplement with games, activities, and sometimes my own teaching.

ENY is cumbersome and there is too much for 1st graders. Would like to see more hands on "games" for kids to truly become engaged.

Anything but Engage NY I like the new and improved edition of Investigations and Bridges. Also like EDM.

We really like Engage New York.

Georgia Department of Education.

I teach in a self-contained specialized program for students with severe learning needs. None of the adopted programs have been successful with my students.

A program that is "free" should not be considered but be a supplemental program.

I really like the fourth grade program. I do think multiples and factors are taught late and the fractions unit could use more direct instruction. I have had to supplement it regularly.

I don't know exactly. All I know is that Eureka Math is great for teaching the standards but the only problem is that it is BORING! I would like to keep using it but also have access to fun engaging activities to go with each module. I don't want to always have to hunt for these activities because I don't have time.

? Good question

Please please please just keep Engage New York/Eureka!!! We have put so much work into using it this year and I would really like to see what our students can do if they continue with the same program. Also after a year of teaching it I will be even better at teaching it next year.

??

A resource student book would be better to accompany Eureka/Math or an online version. Eureka math is a little plain and there is not enough resource pages.

Engage NY has been my favorite math program that I have used (after over 10 years in the district). It is well-scaffolded and my students are thinking mathematically in a way that I haven't experienced.

Everyday math

Would like to see what is currently out there that also aligns with CCC

I don't know specific programs. My opinion is that Eureka is too heavily language based, so students with CD or on the spectrum are now struggling in a subject that they used to have confidence. Also Eureka's attempt to teach several different methods is often confusing to students who barely grasp one technique.

We are using Deanna Jump's first grade math curriculum and love it!

n/a

Bridges accompanied alongside Eureka. It allows visual learners to learn through game based, hands on activities. It does NOT provide addition/subtraction in the sense of providing algorithms, so using Eureka at the same time would cover ALL bases for Kinder students. My students who learned using Bridges had a much stronger math sense by the end of the year than my students using Eureka. This is my second year teaching Eureka. There is not enough hands on learning.

Expressions/Expresiones Bilingual curriculum and wonderful materials!

I can not tell you how much I HATE Engage NY. It takes WAY too much teacher time to read for one thing. It is written in a conversation. If it was written with REAL directions and was more interesting for kids and teachers to look at I might use it. When I did use it, I spent so much time creating things and trying to find the right materials that it just frustrated me to no end. I would like to see Bridges with a supplement of Problem solving. My son uses Bridges in the Hillsboro SD and is having great success.

Engage NY is too paper pencil based. The lessons require a lot of "mini Lessons" before getting to the main concept of the lesson. The mini lessons jump around too much and require a lot of prep for a 5 minute lesson. The kindergarten students groan when math time is announced. For especially low academic students the program is very difficult and overwhelming with all the worksheets. Engage NY is not teacher friendly with too much reading and lots of prep.

More child-friendly and engaging activities, developmentally appropriate!

Kindergarten needs a program that encourages use of lots of manipulatives. We need concrete before abstract.

I would like to have all of the supplies/manipulatives suggested by Eureka math.

Bridges? Something that has more of a balance of hands on math (games) and worksheets. Also, a program that is more differentiated for our below and above grade level kids.

I teach mostly small group high needs kindergartners and first graders who have trouble accessing the content and language needed in Engage NY. I have recently taken a free online "course" with Christina Tondevoid which highlighted a training I was able to take with her. As an ESL teacher I haven't gotten many math trainings or been a part of those learning teams but am expected to take kids from point a to point b. I enjoyed revisiting CT's training but feel I need more on this level to be able to do right by the students I am teaching.

None. I would love to stick with a curriculum for a period of time to see a group at 4th grade that has received the same curriculum materials/vocab/methods for all of their learning years. For two years I have seen my students exit at proficiency levels in multiplication, division, and fractions that was not being achieved previously. The students are able to critically think, explain the "why" not just the "how", and use effective strategies to solve problems.

Kindergarten needs a math program that is manipulative based with a strong focus on number sense. What I have heard from other teachers is that both of these are lacking with Eureka/Engage NY. It is essential that we find something that is hands-on and concrete instead of paper/pencil and abstract.

The new version of Bridges is AWESOME and should also be looked at for the adoption! I know teachers in NY and they call it Enrage NY. Supposedly the dept of ed in NY was supposed to hire teachers to fix it and they made some edits and and repackaged it as Eureka. It is developmentally inappropriate and way too hard for most of the population of our school. CCSS dropped 6th grade to 5th grade and called it "rigorous"; well it is - stiff, hard, and confusing for most students. Supposedly they also stated that it was going to go deeper instead of wider and some units are 38 lessons long. It is simply way too much. Whatever is adopted it should be based on the old NCTM standards that there was nothing wrong with at all.

Not sure, but pick something that isn't as boring as hell.

The daily 3

What more or else do you need to support math instruction and PD? (Optional)

funding to get materials (manipulatives) for specific adopted math program.

Butts in the chair pd.

More small group PD to confer with my colleagues on what works for them, differentiation strategies, organizational methods they use for all the paper, etc.

I need manipulatives. I do not have any and it is difficult for a lot of students.

A way to differentiate my teaching for the amount of time I have to teach math (55 min).

Engage takes up the entire time and I'm not able to get through the entire lesson.

Explicit PD for each grade level after adoption is chosen. Sample videos of instruction on teacher source to access for support. Classrooms equipped with manipulative resources...math racks, subatizing cards, etc.

Before I'd recommend EngageNY, I'd like to see or learn more about Beaverton's view on Math workshop, strategies for creating inquiry and hands on learning opportunities with Engage NY and what supports could be provided. Some lessons have very little active engagement for younger learners. For some lessons, ALOT of prep is involved gathering materials or cutting them out (especially at the younger grades--I taught secondary last

year, primary this year). Also, how can lessons be differentiated for high students--resources and ideas? How can the district support with these things?

Resources that are more developmentally appropriate.

I would welcome any experience with Jonathan Brenden as a refresher!

Honestly, my team and I need more time to plan and make a curriculum/assessments to fit our kids.

I really appreciate the optional PD being offered each month. The third grade instructors are great. The time to share with other teachers is invaluable.

I would like more PD on how to make math instruction hands on at the 5th grade level. So much of the math curriculum at this level is direct instruction based which mainly appeals to visual learners. I want some hands on, interactive techniques that appeal to my hands on learners.

Our first grade team likes the Engage NY curriculum, but we wish it was easier to know what manipulatives and supplies to prep for in a module. There needs to be a materials list that is more comprehensive and easier to access. For example: Hide zero cards - where are they first introduced, and where is the master copy to make them? Also, as a team, we've been copying and pasting the Spanish homework instructions into the English homework in Word, so that instructions are on one document instead of two. Something like this should be available to all teachers who teach Engage NY. I would be happy to be part of a summer cohort team that fixes these little problems and have them available for next fall. How about having a survey about what would make teaching Engage NY easier, since some of us are in the 2nd or 3rd year of teaching it.

Time to look at things.

We need a program that is fun, hands-on, meets goals that students and parents can understand. Whatever program is adopted, teachers need complete training and materials purchased by the district so students can be successful. When the district adopts a program, it seems that all school at all grades should be required to use it so there is consistency across the district. Please look at the new adoption from a child's interest level as well as understand ability for all (staff, students, parents). My parents have expressed so much frustration with ENY.

Observing a master teacher several times!!

Since one of the District module overview presenters is one of my teammates, I query her often, and she shares what she has gleaned from her presenter teammate and others. That is why I have not attended many of the meetings. I think more people would feel more comfortable with Eureka/Engage NY if they attended these meetings!

quality manipulatives, a bank of assessment questions that is rigorous but grade level appropriate. time to create a workshop model and training in how to more math coaches and math push in support.

Calibration would be nice. It takes forever to score the assessments and daily exit tickets, all the while I'm wondering and deliberating on a "final score" instead of each question

getting a score. Then, after all of that, I have to figure out how to put it on the report card. How should I weight exit tickets, mid-module, and end-of-module? Help!! In addition, some PD on how to use it with ability groups would be great. It feels like it only teaches to the middle group of students. Parents want "challenge" work, and in this case the only way I can create / find it, is to use so much time looking online and outside of what is given to us.

More math support for ADHD, ADD, Asperger, etc. or for TAG.

It would be wonderful if the math adoption could include a fast cycle "catch up" style program to use with students who are 2 or more years behind in math. Programs that include a program for use in special education usually have one of these programs that is aligned to the program the kids are using the classroom.

TAG math

I've loved the Module overviews that Tara and Vanessa have offered. Keep it up! I would love more training on extending Engage NY for high-performing math students.

I think leaving teams to create their own assessments, examine and unwrap standards, and decide on which lessons are a part of Oregon and which aren't is a waste of time. The district could do this through a group of teachers so at least there are some common documents and ideas. Armed with that, individual teams could monitor and adjust as needed.

I don't have the materials in hard copy. Takes a lot of printing paper.

Let's be honest, Engage NY has some well designed lessons. I taught it for 1 1/2 years in 4th grade and found most lessons effective. However, I am extremely disappointed with half of the lessons I've taught in fifth grade this year. From an adult perspective they make sense, but the lessons are often confusing to fifth graders. Most of the time my students come up with a much clearer way to showing their work and understanding. I adopt and teach those over the complex Engage NY methods. Also, I hear from primary teachers that there is a lack of manipulative and hands-on activities. This hinders their children from learning and understanding math concepts.

Materials to go with the adoption.

n/a

Enough money in the documart budget to allow to spiral bind all year long. I know that seems like a little thing, but it's huge to me. Money to buy quality materials for ENY (foam place value disks, red/yellow disks, etc.) we make due with what we have and print off paper ones, but they are easily lost and destroyed.

How to teach stuff to struggling learners in a time frame that gets us through all 7 modules even though they will struggle if we move at the recommended pacing by the district. How to teach a lesson in the recommended amount of time per Engage NY given that half of my kids aren't getting it. I am at a high ESL/Title I school. Sure my own daughters could get it (they are at a high SES school in another district). But their teachers disliked Engage NY so much they just didn't use it last year and this year they

(North Clackamas SD) adopted Envision Math. P.S. This survey took longer than 5 minutes... :)

I believe that the math overview trainings are helpful and hope they are continued after the math adoption. With other math instructional practices trainings.

Step by Step visual cards for students to use for multi-step problems....such as long division, adding/subtracting mixed numbers with like denominators and unlike denominators.... Students with learning disabilities, ADHD, Autism, etc. need visual steps to remember processes.

It would be nice to have Engage NY materials printed out and organized into workbooks or spirals. It is a pain to organize items sent from documart and making copies every day is not idea.

We need mathematics intervention materials/curriculum.

How to do small groups and workshop to meet the needs of all learners.

To have training that would help to modify for struggling learners and how to accelerate for strong learners.

Challenge and remedial instruction for the students at either end of the learning spectrum

If we adopt Engage NY, we need supplemental for extensions for students that are already able to complete problem sets independently.

PD on meeting the needs of students who are TAG and/or high fliers.

Resources

Nothing

Time to talk about actual practice, share practice, reflect with colleagues on practice, help for addressing the needs of struggling math learners who are grade levels behind.

Inquiry based instruction; integration with other content

Time to work with grade-level team to plan great instruction.

Time, time, time and materials for centers/rotations

We've had NO paid PD for what we seem to be encouraged to do. Plenty of paid PD for the adoption (three days like with Lit) is essential to buy in and effective implementation. I would LOVE to have attended the workshops that preview units that have been offered.

However, since they are not paid, we can not attend them. Unpaid workshops communicate a lack of interest on the part of the district. We will not volunteer our time for that.

It would be nice to have additional support in building formative and summative assessments that are truly linked to the CCSS for fourth grade. We have found that Engage NY often introduces and tests skills that are not fourth grade standards. This is nice for finding opportunities for students to show a 4 proficiency level, however it would be nice to have a clear distinction between which lessons and assessment items are reaching beyond the expectation for fourth grade.

Time to effectively plan instruction If the math program that is chosen needs to be

supplemented, the district needs to identify what is lacking and then provide all materials & lessons rather than telling us to use our "expertise" or "bag of tricks". Using Eureka math has been challenging although much more effective than Everyday math. However it is very language based so it needs to be adapted for ELLs and low language kids This wasn't given as an option - PD in the form of videos is great and very effective but we should have sub time to watch them, or be allowed to view them during learning team time. Extended pay would be the next option rather than watch videos on our own time. See actual teaching through direct observation or videos.

Time How to meet the needs of students who are not even close to grade level and need direct instruction at their level.

Time with teachers to attack and plan units. I know some hate being forced to leave classroom and meet- but maybe if there was an option "30 teachers can sign up for planning time on this day- and we will get them subs" we could get a coalition of the willing that could really get some great stuff together. Would love to work with PYP schools to make some math specific planners.

Show us other choices!!! We should be looking at other adoption choices!!

Please continue the module overviews after school for extended contract. I missed one because I was sick, but I found the others really helpful!

No matter the math program, we need the supplemental materials and manipulatives that go with it. However I think instead of wasting money we should try to use the manipulatives already existing like dice and unified cubes etc.

How do we make heavy text materials, especially the end of module assessments of Engage NY more accessible to all students?

Money to buy more manipulatives.

I think my school needs more math intervention resources and more staffing to implement math interventions. We do an awesome job in my building with reading interventions as we have a reading specialist and an intervention specialist who both run and monitor reading interventions school wide. This makes the referral process to sped very streamlined and ensures that interventions happen and happen effectively before students are referred to sped. The same is not happening with math as we currently have a person working half time for "math interventions." There needs to be more focus on developing this district wide.

It takes a ton of time to make all the materials for each lesson. Knowing where to store and organize them is a challenge. I am constantly just keeping up with the lesson before. I want permission to use an inquiry based system of math teaching/learning with a decent mix of practical use practice to build skills.

Differentiation for bellow benchmark students in math.

Adding more inquiry Meeting the lows and highs Meeting TAG needs Open Ended/Problem Solving

I miss having a textbook. It's handy to have a textbook to use as a reference, especially for parents. Not everyone has computer access at home to look at the EngageNY videos online.

After using Engage NY in 1st and kinder I feel strongly that a program that requires a teacher to teach math in front of the class with majority whole group instruction does not meet the needs of individual students. With students who are not able to read the directions independently teachers are required to go through the entire lesson whole group which means they have little time to work with individuals and support small groups.

Differentiation for lower and higher students for Engage NY

More training in what is proficient. Also looking at assessment. People have different ideas of what an assessment should look like.

One suggestion that I have is to align each exit ticket to a BSD report card category and put that on the teachersource page.

Money for online apps that can be used in the classroom to challenge the high students and help the strugglers.

how to differentiate Engage NY for our really low students

Thanks! Love the PD I've had with grade level groups from other schools--lots of good ideas. Nice to have time to discuss/plan with grade level teams.

This is the thing--I really want to go to the Eureka Math trainings, but there are so many meetings going on that either those trainings are on the same day, or they are on the only day after school that we don't have a meeting or class until 4:00 anyway. I would really appreciate trainings that aren't just overall, general trainings in the summer when I can participate. The other thing that could help would be for the different TOSAs to organize their trainings in such a way so that we don't have 3 highly needed trainings all on the same day in 3 different parts of the district. I took every single training I could get on Investigations and Everyday Math, as well as anything I could schedule math-wise through Carol Biskupic Knight's connections--it is a matter of not getting the training when it is possible.

Differentiation within a math "program" that is heavily teacher directed/guided.

incorporating technology, pulling small groups

Eureka math is so language based. This is very difficult for the ELLs and SPED kids. It would be wonderful to have more scaffolds and language supports for these students.

I need more differentiation for TAG and struggling readers, especially in terms of HW and problem sets.

As long as I have Everyday Math, I'm good and so are my students.

I feel like we need more years with the same curriculum so students can build upon prior knowledge and skills.

We need more years with the same adaption so students can build on prior skills. We need parents to be informed that what they learned isn't necessarily the best way and

that change is okay.

I have been consistently attending Jessica Clark's presentations on 1st Grade Engage NY which has been so helpful! I really would like to go and watch other teachers who are teaching Engage NY and/or using the Daily 3 to teach math in a more engaging way.

Bilingual activities/materials/curricula support, please!

I need more support with teaching students basic number sense! Many of my students are completely lacking number sense and as a result are struggling with the concepts taught in ENY.

Engage NY needs to add Step-by-step instructions to every Homework that goes home with students! Struggling students have a difficult time taking notes in class and/or remembering how to do the work when they get home, even if they have it on their problem set. Other than that, I love Engage NY.

math manipulatives. Resources for hands on learning.

I believe in a hands on approach for kindergarten. I DO NOT believe that kindergarteners should be pencil papered to death at 5-6 years old.

I'd love to have PD in how to do the Daily 3 Math instruction -- a rotation of topics to engage and allow for smaller group practice and instruction.

Differentiation of the wide variety of student performance. Some students are kinder-5 grade level. Figuring out how, when and where to address the needs of all students makes it challenging. In addition, having material poorly translated makes it even more difficult for TWI teacher. So of us are parents and can not attend PD after school ours. Still, we work from home and try to access ways to reach all learners.

Videos for differentiation for each lesson would be helpful. Students are also confused regarding math vocabulary and how to apply different steps or assess what the word problem is requiring.

Some in school training for Eureka math would be helpful.

I would like to have more resources in how to work towards advanced proficiency in certain areas. Some are easier than others to decide on, but I think teachers think differently about giving a 3 versus a 4 in math on the report card.

Math materials, manipulatives, and resources. Engage NY is all paper in a binder. Not appropriate for elementary. Need more games and manipulatives.

It's very difficult to include all Engage NY lessons into a school year. I would love to see a document that suggests what lessons may be skipped or combined to help ensure that all learning targets are met in one year.

No comment

?

Nothing.

If Eureka Math is considered, we need more training/materials to differentiate. This is difficult with Eureka Math as it stands today.

Differentiation and materials procurement/management

Eureka Math is very workbook and whiteboard heavy and my first graders need more hands on materials and games. I am using Everday Math games to include more interaction and fun!

More practice with manipulatives and better graphics.

A district-wide online math practice resource - one available from the get-go and with district training to help ensure it's usage.

Ways to challenge higher level math students within a self-contained math class.

I think we should get a math kit (similar to the science kits) with all the tools/manipulatives for each module ready to use. We should all have access to appropriate tools to help students engage in and understand math. Also, teachers are spending money of their own to buy math supplements on Teachers Pay Teachers that are "more student-friendly". I personally don't feel I should spend my own money to supplement. I think the district should consider purchasing supplemental resources, so teachers don't have to.

Time to collaborate, organize and plan.

I would like a balanced math program that would include both the interactive math approach of a well-supplied Mathland type program (which helps students to better understand the "why" of math) with the more traditional algorithm style math (which helps students to master the "how" of math). I would also like a math program that helps students to better analyze and solve real world story problems. Finally, a program that also includes a written component would also be good.

I don't feel like Engage New York is Developmentally appropriate OR that it uses best practices for teaching math to Primary grade children. I would PREFER NOT to have Engage New York!!!

More trainings from Christina T - the number sense gal!!!

More trainings with Christina.

Supplemental materials

Math inquiry to achieve common core standards in Kindergarten

I have not been able to make a Thursday afternoon math PD session because of family obligations. I would like to see the same courses offered on Wednesday afternoon, or during school time where I can schedule a sub.

using center games to support math practices

It will be good to have: a clear understanding of the components of a new program and how to use them also. an calibration around the proficiency scores and support materials, games, and ideas to reach all students on grade level, below and above. electronic support

Need answer keys for Engage New York.

Printed teacher guides/instruction and updated (corrected Eureka/Engage NY student and teacher documents). We fixed errors or clarifications on the Engage NY documents,

then received Eureka Math documents with same errors needing editing.

It would be nice to have district created assessments that measure and set a standard for fluency sums to ten (25 problems in a minute and a half?). It seems that this should be uniform. The EngageNY end of unit assessments are heavy on the verbal component and hard for small children to track. I would like to have revised materials as a part of the program. Whatever is adopted should be complete, with all 'holes' addressed and materials provided. Monies should be provided for the purchase of rekenrecks, (individual, 120 'add a row' and in line.)

I'm curious how to build stamina in my students during math time. They have fabulous reading stamina but when it comes to math I don't see that love for it and the ability to build stamina throughout the year...

Some resources to help with differentiation, both for high and struggling students. Some materials to help with students who cannot read well enough to understand the math story problems, perhaps access to story problems with visual supports or written as a rebus, for example.

Once something is adopted, give teachers the FULL training we need to properly and successfully teach math/math adoption. I had NO Engage NY training prior to teaching it this year. I make it work because I have been teaching long enough that I know WHAT to teach to get the lesson learned at the end of the math session.

I believe that I have witnessed my students this year thinking at a higher level of learning compared to last year students (teaching Everyday Math) up to this point in the school year, however, I am struggling with parent support at home. I get many complaints from parents saying they don't understand the homework and are wanting to know the language taught in class to use at home. They struggle supporting their student at home because the concepts taught are very different from the way they learned. I would say that I need help providing my parents with the knowledge, tools and resources to support their student at home.

Math tools for classroom to support number sense teaching and student understanding.

Time (TWI classroom), manipulatives, PD

more manipulatives in the classroom, math games, etc. for hands on experience.

rekenrek for the classroom games that practice the skills introduced for more hands on learning.

Time to plan and/or become familiar with new curriculum. All the manipulatives necessary to teach the curriculum effectively.

I think that well done videos to support the NY/ Engage curriculum would be helpful. I like also having the plans that Nicole, Jennifer etc. have done with their thoughts and how they changed things to be very helpful. Even more input on ideas or modifications from other teachers who have used the program for a couple years would be helpful.

Like above, I would like to see less PD on how to use math programs and more PD on how to teach Math concepts. I see so many teachers rely heavily on a curriculum

because they do not have a strong background knowledge of current math instruction practices!

Mostly just differentiation strategies for TAG and struggling learners.

Purchasing all materials needed for Engage NY lessons is very time consuming, expensive and difficult to organize for kindergarten students. They often call for bags of pennies, or cotton balls or play dough for each student.

The unit overview times are extremely helpful! The materials these teachers have combined are invaluable. We need MathRacks and training! We need dice. I don't have all the material I need to do math! toothpicks, magna tiles, cards.....

DIFFERENTIATION! This program steam rolls below level students. And when followed completely, leaves zero time for small group or individual conferencing. While Everyday Math may have had holes, at least it had a component for below level students, as well as above. I'd also like to hear more about how teachers with similar populations make this work in their rooms, because it is not a true adoption in the sense that it "comes with everything". My workload (and out of pocket expense) has significantly increased with all the ordering, organizing, prepping, buying of 1,000+ straws etc. If we are expected to "assemble" an adoption, then we need to be given the time and resources to do so. And we need PD from people who have "designed" or actually used this.

Commoncore worksheets (online) IXL math (website for kids)

Besides what I just mentioned in the last question about Everyday Math, and about appreciating the monthly gatherings at Hazeldale for Engage NY, (and my interest in continuing to participate if they are held next year), I realize there are a few areas in this survey that I am not yet knowledgeable about....such as 8 Mathematical Practices. I was a little unclear about the question about "3" across the district, so I was not sure how to answer that actually. I would like more PD around assessments and rubrics. The end of the module assessment for Module 3 has been a concern for our team, for example. I need to dig into both the BSD aligned rubric for Engage NY, and the BSD Math Rubric. Thank you.

How to use adopted curriculum in a workshop structure for math. More differentiation opportunities for struggling students and high achievers.

My biggest struggle is with problem solving. Any sessions that are centered around great strategies to teach problem-solving (or Real World Problems) as we call them, would be awesome!

I would just like visibility into how other teachers differentiate using Eureka math, within a large class (30+ students), and how they can carve out more time for small group work. Especially for higher level students. Also would love to know what online resources other teachers are using, as well will get devices for students soon!

I like the video links by Duane Habecker and would love to see more that were developed specifically for students (kid friendly...inviting) and accessible from home and school to support Eureka Math.

I loved the Module workshop I attended at the beginning of the year, which focused on teaching the first module for grade 5. I expected but was disappointed that I did not receive notification of workshops for the other modules. I'm concerned with the curriculum currently being used at the middle school level in Beaverton. Colleagues who've used it gave negative reviews, and it doesn't seem to align with what's being used at the elementary level. I'm hoping the middle school math curriculum is being seriously considered right now too, and being aligned appropriately to correspond with the high standards of CCSS.

This is my first year teaching Eureka and an overview of it would be nice. I think it would be very beneficial to have a session where we are shown all of its resources. It would be great to find out more about these videos and helpful links in teacher source. A "Helpful Eureka Tips" document would be nice too. I would love to attend the module overview sessions, but am unable to make the times they are offered. Is there anyway to put some of them online or vary the times they are offered?

I would like hands-on training and time to practice teaching a complete Kindergarten lesson with my classroom time frame/schedule. Or a one-on-one consultation on how to teach within my class' schedule. That would be most beneficial for me.

Support in how to balance the math time between problem solving, fluency, new content instruction, and application/practice.

Test skill sheets to complement the tests. More PD on the actual teaching of the module. The module training sessions I went to turned into strategy sessions for how to teach ENY, which was helpful. However, I would like to really dig into the module with peers to dissect how to best teach it for student success.

How to meet challenge and lower students and how to align challenge with standards and resources

It would be nice to have more of the manipulatives readily available for Engage NY.

Assessments that reflect the instruction for each module. Teacher guide/resource that is more thorough/clear than the current guide. The current guide does not consistently have enough information for teachers. Any PD around ENY would be helpful!! Sharing resources, organization, methods of instruction with other similar grade teachers would be valuable.

More ways and resources to differentiate instruction for the high kids. Time to collaborate and calibrate our scoring. Exit slip answers.

A session on how to encourage/enable stronger math talk and sharing. OMLI type stuff! DO NOT ADOPT EngageNY! Please. The heavy heavy emphasis on paper/worksheets totally goes against several BSD points: reducing our energy imprint, using teacher judgment for decision making in determining what our students need and the use of best teaching practices (whole group instruction and worksheets are in no way best practices). The amount of time it takes me to read/consider each lesson + time to prepare the zillions of papers flies in the face of time I can spend after school or during my prep period

considering how Math Workshop went that day; who needs prodding, who needs a lesson review, who needs practice on something EngageNY has some very powerful math concepts. But that content must be able to be found in a better venue or from somewhere else to allow us to use these concepts (number bonds, for one thing) in a much more user friendly and child friendly and math workshop friendly manner. As always, we know as teachers that telling children something will result in few changes in math thinking. Letting them practice and explore and work through challenges gives children a high likelihood of adding these new understandings to their math-ness. Same goes for teachers: hands on, working through learning how to use a workshop model (for instance) and best practices. And the ability of non-title schools to have access to good math tools and instruction (Christina Tondevoid, math racks).

Formal Training - math was always easy for me to teach (even investigations) - no more Classroom walk throughs would be great, as would watching model lessons with kids. This would take sub release, and although that's not ideal, it's great to see lessons live, then having the opportunity to de-brief with colleagues about what the students were doing.

Since Engage NY needs so many materials, a make-it take-it organization kind of a workshop would be helpful to get people started and not feel so overwhelmed with that piece.

More PD with the subitizing and such for kinder and lower grades.

Stick with a curriculum and support it with PD. Have materials available for students who are significantly below grade level, especially at upper elementary.

With whatever program we go with, I hope we have materials to go with the adoption. It's been really difficult to implement ENY with only a wordy script and no pre-made manipulatives or other resources to go along with it.

nothing

A comprehensive K12 curriculum

Material preparation

It would be awesome to have math coaches within the building to support specific teacher needs within the classroom. We never have time to observe others teaching math, or have someone observe us to help us with our teaching strategies.

Collaboration with teachers at the same grade from different schools.

Just time to piece together the program (ENY), teacher source materials, games, activities, and other supplemental items into really good lessons.

Eureka/Engage NY materials are good; however the lessons don't use manipulatives often(or at all). The lessons are also very "language heavy" which makes it extra challenging for our ELL students. LOVE the exit tickets....

Provide manipulatives.. If keeping Eureka Math, we need supplements with games, hands-on activities, investigation-based inquiries that make math REAL

We need the materials that are asked for in Engage NY...spinners, unifix cubes, dice. It takes so long to make all the materials that I want to do this again next year.

Using engage ny for different learners daily. We use a math daily 5 model surrounding the concept development but what about the kids who aren't ready for the concept development. Dif days are used on Fridays but how to imbed daily is a huge goal of ours. With our ability groups in math, I find that students cannot access Eureka even when I try to intro skills from curriculum one or two grades below. I find I am able to plug holes my students have using outside resources more effectively. Of course, then students are missing opportunities to practice the "Eureka" way.

Be consistent as a district. Stick with something.

We have been fortunate to have a math coach supporting our 5th grade team. We have re-written all of the end of module assessments, re-structuring the layout to give students more room and to ensure that the problems on the test are measuring the applicable standards. We've also designed end of topic quizzes. Engage has a surprising amount on their module assessments that do not apply at all to the relevant standards.

Manips! Worksheets at the Kindergarten level are not appropriate to lead instruction. We are asked to prep lots of materials for a five minute lesson. It's not worth it half the time. Materials for each lesson need to be provided ie, counting cubes, dice, spinners, math path, or items from mathmatically minded. We are required to make everything!

I need more time to work with other educators that teach my program to discuss what they are doing in their classrooms for math. All of our students are so individual and thus, have very different needs that a one size, fits all model does not apply.

The templates, cards and other supporting materials with engage ny are cumbersome in creating and have to be remade every year. High quality colored, laminated sets for each grade level that are organized in a clear way would make all the difference.

Would love more info. on games/hands on learning to support EngageNY. There were a lot embedded in EverydayMath.

I would appreciate some PD specifically for 3-5 teachers that has to do with math instruction. I would also love it to be taught by a master teacher who has experience using Engage NY in small groups so that we get practical tips rather than theory.

I don't know exactly. All I know is that Eureka Math is great for teaching the standards but the only problem is that it is BORING! I would like to keep using it but also have access to fun engaging activities to go with each module. I don't want to always have to hunt for these activities because I don't have time. Also, I need something to help reach those TAG and high flyers.

If we adopt Eureka math then a good plan needs to be put in place for all the supplies needed for each module. In a "boxed set" we would have3 those supplies provided.

I like when we get the half days to look at the next module, create the learning targets and remake the assessments.

Workshop model in Math. Unfortunately there aren't the same professional 'mentors' in

math as there are in literacy, such as professional books, workshops, institutes, etc. It is very difficult to find math help to learn to teach all students.

I need more PD targeted in Spanish implementation.

need an adoption that is not sooooo heavy with language need an adoption with built in differentiation that could be used in Gen Ed, intervention or SpEd NEED MATH INTERVENTION!!!

I need more help with how to teach math to a multi-grade level special education classroom with a wide range of abilities and learning styles. It is hard to meet everyone's needs with my current knowledge and resources.

Synergy merging of math assessments to calculate grades.

My only struggle with Engage NY is the lack of imbedded differentiation. I would love some district support or resources for high flyers, fast finishers and TAG students, as well as some resources to support students who are struggling to make progress. THANKS!

I believe that the most important pd that should be happening in our district is calibrating proficiency scoring.

More inquiry based problem solving, more differentiation tools

Best practices other than walk to math which is very disruptive to students' day.

We need materials in Spanish. Correctly translated, correctly formatted. The titles of the documents are all mixed up. Exit slip titled on homework pages, home pages titles problem sets, etc. The teacher's guide needs to be in Spanish. I am so worried about all of the holes that students in 4-5 have. They have only been taught with Everyday Math, and now this new curriculum builds on years past, and the students are completely lost. EngageNY is not a good curriculum for low SES schools. The students need more number sense practice, even in the upper grades. EngageNY introduces complex processes, like long division, simplifying fractions, and adding/subtracting fractions quickly, refers to the 'standard algorithm, but never formally teaches the students or give the students time to practice. The curriculum either assumes that the students have had it before, or assumes that the students should be able to pick up the algorithms quickly and easily which is not the case in our school.

Materials for low students (especially word problems) - preferably created by beaverton teachers.

I think we need to consider a different math adoption. Eureka is not teacher friendly, too much paper and pencil so it is easy for kids to lose focus and they lose the joy of learning math. Math is a natural joy for children. When I say it's time for math, my students groan. This is a disservice to Kindergarten students and I feel we should consider adding Bridges curriculum back in along side Eureka.

I need PD on ESL support, teaching math language. Supporting learning in class to transfer to homework. More support on teaching/ student practicing math only with 55min. I have taught for 20 years. . .I'm good.

I like the games and information that Chistina Tondevoid has presented. These games support kindergarten students in the learning of math in a fun and interesting way. Her Fluency through Flexibility (Building number sense) has help my students learn the values of numbers.

Time

Development for stations and time to organize/prepare/gather resources!

Access to supplemental materials

Eureka is very difficult for students who are severely below in a grade level or for students who enter BSD with very little English. These students need something else!

I would love some PD on teaching students at their rate and level. Ideally, I would do a math workshop model, but I have not been successful with it thus far. Also, I would love to use an online program like Front Row, but lack the technology to make it successful.

I suppose I wrote the previous message in the wrong spot...but I know that other classroom teachers feel that we need to adopt curriculums that help with the number sense so that our students will have access and learn these basics before we drop them into the heavy content and language needs expected by Engage NY.

I would like specific assessments for specific CCSS standards. If I need 1.OA.8 I WANT AN ASSESSMENT with that labeled on the assessment. I don't like a whole bunch of standards on one assessment page.

Sub release time or extended contract to plan with my team.

I am a TWI teacher in fifth grade, and we need teacher modules in Spanish. We need more Spanish resources/translations badly. I spent most of my time translating application problems, parts of the teacher manual and other materials.

I need extension activities that align to each module for my TAG and high-flyer kids. It would be great to have some challenge activities for each module that would build on the concepts being taught.

Simply adopt a math program that has a developmentally appropriate scope and sequence that is based on NCTM and brain research. WE are EQUITY (supposedly). Additionally, recognize that all schools are not the same. Some kindy's come in knowing a lot and some schools they don't know their colors, letters, how to spell or recognize their name, numbers to 10 let alone how to add and subtract. By the time they reach upper elementary grades they are missing so many foundations that more "rigorous" challenging and deeper thinking is very difficult to near impossible. AT these schools there needs to be more of an effort to keep class sizes small so that we can work with students who need more foundational supports. Add science teachers and more math specialists to work with small groups of students. How about after school math camp (free). Students have snack, get recess, then get math lessons integrated with the arts or whatever their learning style happens to be.

PD times that don't start at 4:00; I cannot get to the meetings on time.

I would like to know more about teaching with Eureka math and flexible grouping.

Number of daily responses




Elementary Math Instructional Materials Teacher Survey Data

Approximately 800 K-5 classroom teachers, with an additional 100+, special education, ELL and other support staff were surveyed at the end of January 2016. 535 teachers responded, representing at least 90 teachers at each grade level (K-5), including approximately 30 special education teachers and 10 ELL teachers.


In addition to the questions below, teachers were also asked about their instructional practices, teaching models, professional development needs and preferences, and assessment practices.

The portion of survey data included below is focused solely on the topic of instructional materials. Additional survey data will be provided on a separate document.

Eureka/Engage NY [How often do you use these resources for math instruction?]




Everyday Math [How often do you use these resources for math instruction?]



- Everyday Math was adopted in 2009. Beaverton teachers were asked to teach the new Common Core State Standards in 2013-14. The majority of teachers have been teaching with Eureka/Engage NY materials for most of the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years.


I need more training with the Eureka/Engage NY curriculum.



Nope, I'm good	193	38.1%
Some videos might help	142	28.1%
I need sit-down PD	101	20%
I need a wide range of training	70	13.8%

- 38% of teachers using Eureka/Engage NY are not requesting further training with the program.
- 28% would find videos to be sufficient training.



Eureka/Engage NY materials are effective at teaching the standards.



Strongly Disagree: 1	36	7.1%
2	106	20.9%
3	228	45.1%
Strongly Agree: 4	136	26.9%

- 72% of teachers using Eureka/Engage NY agree the materials are effective at teaching the standards.
- This can be compared to 48% reported by Beaverton teachers the last time they were surveyed with *Investigations* in 2008.
- 24 of the 36 who “strongly disagreed” were Kindergarten and Grade 1 teachers and mostly new to teaching it this year.
- Kindergarten and Grade 1 teachers made up more than 44% of those that rated the effectiveness at teaching the standards a 2.
- Dual-immersion teachers expressed concern for the need of quality and consistent materials in the language of instruction.

Disaggregated by years teaching Eureka/Engage NY:




- Beaverton teachers with more experience using Eureka/Engage NY are much more likely to have higher ratings than those with less experience for both the effectiveness at teaching the standards and the consideration as an adoption.

- When prompted in the comment section, “What other math programs should be considered?”, the top three were:
 1. Eureka/Engage NY
 2. Bridges
 3. Everyday Math
- The others were mentioned 5 or less times:
 - Deanna Jumps (5)
 - Math Expressions (2)
 - enVision (2)
 - Georgia Math (2)
- The following were mentioned one time:
 - Go Math
 - Math Their Way
 - Origo Ed Stepping Stones
 - Investigations
- Over 40 of the open-ended comments showed concern with Eureka/Engage NY. Their concerns mostly centered around teacher-directed, worksheet-driven, and lack of hands-on and student-engaging lessons.
- Over 80 indicated interest in staying with Eureka/Engage NY with additional supports to be provided by the district (materials/manipulatives, professional development, etc.)


SECONDARY MATHEMATICS TEACHER SURVEY

Math Survey Demographics


How many years have you been teaching in the Beaverton School District?



How many years have you been teaching overall?



What is your current work assignment?



High School Materials Survey

What materials are you using this year?	What materials are you using for differentiation and high cognitive demand in your courses?
Forester	Teacher Created, Online Resources
IB/AP	my own creations
IB/AP, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Teacher Created
McDougal Littell	My own
McDougal Littell	Teacher Created
McDougal Littell, IB/AP	Teacher Created
McDougal Littell, IB/AP, Larson	Teacher Created, Online Resources
McDougal Littell, IB/AP, Teacher Created	Teacher Created
McDougal Littell, IB/AP, Teacher Created	Teacher Created
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created	Teacher Created, Online Resources
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created	Teacher Created
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created	Teacher Created
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created	Teacher Created, Online Resources

High School Materials Survey

What materials are you using this year?	What materials are you using for differentiation and high cognitive demand in your courses?
McDougal Littel, Teacher Created, Discovering Geometry (Key Curriculum Press)	Teacher Created, Discovering Geometry (Key Curriculum Press)
McDougal Littel, Teacher Created, Foester, WHfreeman	Teacher Created, Online Resources
McDougal Littel, Teacher Created, Larson - for Precalculus	Teacher Created
McDougal Littel, the practice of stats	the practice of stats (newer addition)
MVP	Teacher Created
MVP	Engage NY, Teacher Created
MVP	MVP
MVP, Cengage	Teacher Created, Online Resources
MVP, Engage NY, Teacher Created	MVP, Engage NY
MVP, Engage NY, Teacher Created, Kuta	Teacher Created
MVP, IB/AP, Practice of Statistics	MVP, LIIEngage NY, Teacher Created, OnIL-3ine

High School Materials Survey

What materials are you using this year?	What materials are you using for differentiation and high cognitive demand in your courses?
	Resources
MVP, McDougal Littell	Teacher Created, Online Resources
MVP, McDougal Littell, Teacher Created	MVP, Teacher Created
MVP, Teacher Created	Teacher Created, Online Resources
MVP, Teacher Created, PreCalculus: An Investigation of Functions by Lippman and Rasmussen, Open Source text	Teacher Created, Online Resources
Pre-Calculus Test by Houghton-Mifflin, IB Test by Pearson	Teacher Created, Online Resources
Teacher Created	Teacher Created
Teacher Created	Teacher Created
Teacher Created, various	Teacher Created, Online Resources, various
McDougal Littell, IB/AP, Teacher Created, The Practice of Statistics (Starnes)	Teacher Created
IB/AP, Functions Modeling Change, Oxford IB	Teacher Created, Online Resources, IB books

High School Materials Survey	
What materials are you using this year?	What materials are you using for differentiation and high cognitive demand in your courses?
books	

Middle School Materials Survey	
What materials are you using this year?	What materials are you using for differentiation and high cognitive demand in your courses?
cmp2, Mathcounts	cmp2, Mathcounts
Engage NY, McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Engage NY, Teacher Created, Online Resources
Engage NY, McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, Connected Math	Teacher Created, Online Resources
Engage NY, McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, NCTM	Engage NY, Teacher Created, Online Resources
Engage NY, Oregon Focus	Engage NY

Middle School Materials Survey

What materials are you using this year?	What materials are you using for differentiation and high cognitive demand in your courses?
Engage NY, Oregon Focus	Engage NY, Teacher Created, Online Resources
Engage NY, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Engage NY, Teacher Created, Online Resources
Engage NY, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Engage NY, Teacher Created, Online Resources, Oregon Focus
Engage NY, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Online Resources, teacherspayteachers
Engage NY, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Engage NY, Teacher Created, Online Resources
Engage NY, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Engage NY, Teacher Created, Online Resources
Engage NY, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Teacher Created, Online Resources
Engage NY, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Engage NY, Teacher Created, Online Resources
Engage NY, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, Connected Math	Engage NY, Teacher Created, Online Resources, Connected Math & Oregon Focus
McDougal Littell, Oregon Focus	
McDougal Littell, Oregon Focus, APEX	Online Resources, McDougal Littell
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created	AMC, Mathcounts, ARML

Middle School Materials Survey

What materials are you using this year?	What materials are you using for differentiation and high cognitive demand in your courses?
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created	Teacher Created
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Teacher Created, Online Resources
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Teacher Created, Online Resources
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Online Resources
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Teacher Created, Online Resources
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, CMP	Teacher Created, Online Resources, CMP
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, CMP2	Teacher Created
MVP, McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Connected Math Project	Teacher Created, Online Resources
MVP, McDougal Littell, Teacher Created,	MVP, Teacher Created, Online Resources,

Middle School Materials Survey

What materials are you using this year?	What materials are you using for differentiation and high cognitive demand in your courses?
Discovering Geometry; Forester's Algebra and Trigonometry	Discovering Geometry and Forester text good for high cognitive demand
MVP, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	MVP, Teacher Created, Online Resources
MVP, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Teacher Created, Online Resources
Oregon Focus	Teacher Created
Oregon Focus	Teacher Created, CMP
Oregon Focus, Common Core Math 6, CCM 7, CCM 8 (books with lessons/resources for CCSS math)	See above; also OF challenge/support worksheets
Oregon Focus, Connected Math	Teacher Created, Online Resources, Challenge Worksheets in Connected Math and Oregon Focus
Oregon Focus, Connected Math	Teacher Created, Connected Math
Oregon Focus, various worksheet creating websites	Online Resources
Teacher Created, AIMS, Estimation 180,	Teacher Created

Middle School Materials Survey

What materials are you using this year?	What materials are you using for differentiation and high cognitive demand in your courses?
WODB?, 3 Acts by Dan Meyer	
Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Glencoe and TAG projects (interdisciplinary math-sci).
Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Teacher Created, Online Resources
Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Teacher Created
Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Teacher Created, Online Resources
Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, CMP	Teacher Created, Online Resources
Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, Connected Math	Teacher Created, Online Resources, Connected Math
Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, Connected Math	Teacher Created, Online Resources
Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, Connected Math	Teacher Created, Online Resources
Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, Connected Math	Teacher Created

Middle School Materials Survey

What materials are you using this year?	What materials are you using for differentiation and high cognitive demand in your courses?
Teacher Created, Oregon Focus, digital resources	Teacher Created, Online Resources
The Discovering Series	Teacher Created
MVP, Engage NY, McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	MVP, Engage NY, Teacher Created, Online Resources
McDougal Littell, Carnegie Learning	Teacher Created, Online Resources, Carnegie Learning
McDougal Littell, Functions Modeling Change (PreCalculus) and Stewart (AP Calculus)	Teacher Created, Teacher Created
McDougal Littell, IB/AP, NCTM website, IMP, Discovering Geo	Teacher Created, Online Resources, IMP, Disco Geo
McDougal Littell, Teacher Created, Oregon Focus	Teacher Created, Online Resources
MVP	MVP
Teacher Created, Rogowski	textbook

Do you support using these materials?

Yes, I do support using Math Vision Project Materials: 22 representatives (95%)

Comments below:

- It is coherent and high quality
- It's easier to teach. The intros are compelling. The materials still need to be proofread. I like the continual review, but I think the reviews need to be spread out more. That being said, the program as presented is fairly rigid and does not seem conducive to modification by the teachers where it should be. There is no opportunity for re-teaching in the schedule. We should be able to create and use our own assessments.
- I like how they look and would like to try teaching it, but I already like to have a task-based classroom so it won't be an uncomfortable shift for me.
- I can support these materials. It has been difficult this year not having the teachers' guide always available, but I have appreciated Geoff doing one for us! Also, since I have completed one year, next year will be better. I still wish we could have longer time and next year we will have a little longer, but some middle schools have 90 min!
- I helped choose these
- Best materials we could find; great tasks but also provides flexibility for teachers.
- Connected to problem solving; Content is in context and not compartmentalized; students actually do math; they can see themselves as mathematicians
- Less compartmentalization; broader view & continued use of (functions; skills enhances connectivity and deepens understanding
- My students are doing better with quadratics then ever before; factoring, completing the square, etc.
- Because of all the above mentioned reasons
- I think it's nice to have a curriculum that is open source, that can be tweaked, and that allows students to explore their work...booyah
- The positives outweigh the negatives; I think we'll fix the problems that currently exist with more experience
- I think it's a good direction for us to go in as a district
- I remain in preference of a non-integrated sequence; within the constraints of an integrated sequence, I support this choice; it was my vote last spring and I've seen nothing to change my mind
- I helped pick this curriculum

No, I do not support using Math Vision Project Materials: 1 representative (5%)

Comments below.

- Don't support w/47 minutes. Although the general concepts are good, I think developing AGS 1 students need more direct guidance and repetition. I think the MVP materials have good intentions but dictate how I teach. Some classes or groups need materials taught in different methods. If I deviate from the program, later lessons don't work. I feel like it takes away my teacher judgment of what my kids need, but I'll do it.

What do you like about the MVP Materials? What is going well?

- Student engagement
- Student centered (not teacher lecture followed by just practice)
- Open ended questions and tasks where students plus teacher work together to solve
- Practice (HW) looks “normal” for parents
- Students can write on their worksheets
- Lots of classroom discussion
- Keeps going back to previous material
- Sequence (integrated)
- Having classwork/homework all in one book
- Spiraling is great. The mix of targets between algebra, geometry and statistics is good
- Great discoveries (most of the time) for mid to upper level kids
- I like the spiraling curriculum. It helps keep the content fresh & build the abilities of the struggling students
- I really like the sequence of instruction & the way the materials build on previous topics to build new concepts.
- I also like (in most cases) the investigative nature of the activities & how students are asked to explain their thinking
- I also really like the spiraling. It is invaluable for students to revisit material and continually practicing skills
- Combined targets for algebra 1, geometry, algebra 2, and Probability & Stats
- Problem sets spiral, Problems are based in context, Problems are rich
- I love the spiral curriculum
- Students are more engaged
- Discovery type lessons
- Students talk to each other about math
- Student thinking
- Spiral curriculum
- Contextual learning
- Student engagement
- Supports group work among students
- Good student communication
- Task based lessons
- More student centered than teacher directed instruction
- Critical thinking
- Continuity through the three years blending of AGS
- I love how this allows for exploration, problem started, and student centered learning
- Spiraling
- Focus on mathematical practices: communication, problem solving, modeling
- Integration of algebra/geometry/stats: less compartmentalized
- Focus on collection of evidence for student assessment: more opportunities for student success
- More real world connections
- I like the detailed teacher notes, the constructivist approach, the emphasis on problem solving and understanding, and the spiral, built in multiple opportunities
- Student understanding is going well!
- I like: integrated A-G-S, conceptual/constructivist approach, online accessibility, aligned to common core
- Promotes thinking; very rich problems
- Spiral of concepts allows students to have multiple opportunities to show proficiency
- I haven't taught it, but I like that the curriculum spirals, which gives students many opportunities to learn and assess on the targets
- I also like that the curriculum is task-based and promotes problem solving in different contexts
- I like that it is more holistic – that is, the curriculum focuses on integrating the math in different areas
- Also that it weaves real connections throughout
- It is fairly easy to teach...I'm getting more used to it and so are the students
- Spiraling content, application based, reinforces reading across content initiatives

- Spirals
- All inclusive w/warm up, lesson & HW in one spot
- Includes tasks & applications
- Extensions / honors
- I like the tie to common core
- I like that we are asking students to discover relationships and find patterns and connections

Where do we need to supplement? What additional supports do we need?

- Tier I&II supports (year 2 we have been creating these throughout the year)
- Exit tickets (formative assessments for each lesson...we have created for year 2)
- Definition sheets per module
- Incorporation w/ AVID strategies
- Explicit academic and content vocabulary instruction (constructing meaning)
- Worked through problems
- A little more direct teaching
- There needs to be more room for direct instruction, as the text assumes the students already know things that they don't
- The curriculum is VERY difficult for low level students
- Since Westview no longer offers Alg/Geo, those students have a really hard time
- It's hard to say because they are already reworking the units we were concerned about
- Currently, the curriculum expects too much prior knowledge for many of our students
- I like the parent guides
- I think there needs to be more resources for kids to check when they miss class
- I think that our sped & ESL students who have lower reading levels may need support
- We need to provide support to 3 years worth of AGS teachers, AGS 1, AGS 2, AGS 3
- Tier support material
- Review packets
- I don't think teachers should supplement without looking at the whole sequence of the curriculum
- I do think the exit tickets & tier support we are creating is inline with the purpose of each lesson
- Vocab sheets
- Version 2 with fewer errors
- Tier support materials
- Exit tickets
- Unit plans, unit tests
- For both accelerated and remediation students; need for further development of skills
- Not having taught this yet, I'm not sure where we need to supplement, however, we will need to support teachers with lots of PD for both instruction & grading
- Are there materials to support our SpEd, ESL kids
- Parent guide, Lessoneer, test bank are all great starts
- Make sure people continue to share anything they create / find throughout the year
- We need all of the solutions w/all of the details for each module
- New teachers or teachers who are not strong in math struggle not having the solutions worked out (not just answers)
- Teachers will also need Tier I and II, Exit tickets, multi assessments, extensions & stuff like that (see AGs 2 on Google site)
- I've heard complaints that MVP is not "deep"...in other words, there are not many support materials (work sheets, tests, power points, etc.)
- Sometimes they just need more practice of the skills...a few times I've used the old Algebra worksheets to add some additional practice where I found it was needed
- I don't have anything to say about supplementation
- I am glad we have planned supports for the teachers, through PD and Lessoneer website
- Perhaps more practice? I'll know more after I teach it next year

- We need homework sets to give...more quizzes would be nice
- Need Tiered support materials for equation solving, graphing $y=m+b$, data display types, etc. The curriculum assumes students have retained these skills
- Grading is a paradigm shift: Today – we cover one thing/assess & move to the next; New – touch on topic/assess, how do we assess proficiency against what part of the target?
- I would appreciate knowing the author's intent when new concepts are introduced. It can be unclear how deep to go
- Concerns about low end students & level of difficulty for them
- Concerned about what the grade book will look like to connect every assessment to 4 targets/standards
- I would prefer a spiraled traditional curriculum with discovery activities and connections opportunity. I do appreciate the added solutions guide and would really like the Lessoneer.
- Time is a very large concern in my discomfort in the program. I don't have time to allow students to always make the connections and help with their frustrations.
- Also, we need shared assessments/study guides/extension worksheets.
- Middle school AGS I meeting time

Comment about MVP materials related to supporting instruction that enhances student learning of the CCSS Math standards and developing the skills defined by the eight mathematical practices.

- I like the new standards and help shape mathematical thinking
- I think it does fine, but there should be more flexibility about how they are assessed. It would be nice if there were some slack built into the schedule in order to reteach certain topics
- I will know more next year
- The materials seem to be developed to support students in the CCSS and practices
- These materials do follow the math CCSS standards and promote the eight mathematical practices
- I have not personally used materials in over 20 years of teaching that do a better job at this than the MVP materials
- Sit & get teachers will struggle w/these and need PD/mentor/support
- Whereas it was on teachers before (current curriculum) to develop these on their own, the activities are already embedded into the MVP
- I think it does a great job...love these materials
- Spiral > continued review throughout the curriculum
- Best practices are embedded in the courses. Contextual problems are used throughout
- Teachers who teach directly out of the examples of a book will need support
- Yes, students have to communicate more...more critical thinking
- I have heard teachers who teach AGS comment that their students are better problem solvers & have better perseverance. Because the standards are integrated, I would assume that students will have better retention
- Good opportunities for the students to make discoveries. Unfortunately, due to the massive difference in ability levels, this is not always a success
- With the new LT #1 & 2, this focuses on the communication and problem solving, which are skills students need throughout their schooling.