

Data Brief
Status of CMSI Elementary School Implementation:
Considerations for OMS Budget Planning

January 13, 2005

A brief report to the CPS Office of Mathematics and Science
From the UIC CMSI Evaluation Project

Carol R. Fendt
Sara Ray Stoelinga
Stacy A. Wenzel

For further information, contact Stacy Wenzel,
swenzel@uic.edu, 312-413-9221

The conclusions drawn in this report reflect the viewpoints of the authors. While there are many potential viewpoints, these reflect a systematic analysis of data by external evaluators. The hope is that these findings can facilitate improvement of this and related programs through open discussion and consideration of data-driven understandings.

This report is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant No. 0085115.

Background

This data brief is based on the UIC CMSI Evaluation Project's work focused on the implementation of CMSI supported curricular materials in elementary schools during the fall of 2003 through fall of 2004.¹ We review key findings around the various types of schools implementing (Intensive Support schools, former Readiness schools, and schools on academic probation) and around issues of policy planning, professional development, and variance in schools across district Instructional Areas and curriculum chosen. Next we discuss implications of these findings as they relate to budget and other resource allocation decisions that CPS and the Office of Mathematics and Science will be making for the remainder of the 2004-05 school year and the upcoming 2005-06 year.

Findings are presented in brief. Additional detail on these findings can be found in previous reports or will be forthcoming in future evaluation reports.

Findings

CMSI Intensive Support Schools: The original strategic model

Throughout 2003-2004 and September through November 2004 we collected comparative case study data for 9 CMSI Intensive Support schools--7 of which were finding successes in implementing CMSI math and science curricula in comparison to 2 schools facing more challenges.² Our interpretation of these data suggests that to have the best chance of implementation success, CPS should support Intensive Support schools. This includes setting a foundation in the first year such that

- Schools make a voluntary decision to implement CMSI and have the appropriate instructional materials needed to support their implementation
- Teachers and school administrators have positive experiences in ongoing professional development around new curricula
- Principals support CMSI as exemplified by scheduling 60 minutes for math/science classes, providing sufficient time for teachers to have grade level meetings about implementation, and supporting release time for teachers/Specialists to attend ongoing professional development opportunities
- Each school has a full-time Specialist who works with teachers in their classrooms
- Some teacher leaders emerge from each school's staff to help carry the Initiative forward.

Examination of the early second year data to date for these schools does not show any clear distinguishing patterns between more and less successful schools. Instead there are interesting common positive and negative experiences across all 9 schools during the first months of 2004-05. These include

- Variation and similarities across the work roles of second year Specialists with some teaching half-time, many wishing to but finding it difficult to visit all implementing teachers regularly, and many spending significant time managing curricular materials and dealing with orders that had not arrived on time.
- Principals with differing views on how they will use the Specialist in 2004-05 and whether they will keep the position filled or not in 2005-06.
- Challenges in getting teachers to professional development given the needs to get larger numbers to workshops and yet not have whole grade level of teachers out of the building at the same time. There was also the challenge to serve teachers with some wider ranges of experiences and skills in using the new curricula.

¹ We recognize there are multiple ways to define "implementation" of the CMSI curricular materials of Everyday Math, Math Trailblazers, Connected Math, Math Thematics and the various science instructional materials selected by OMS. In the analyses for this data brief, we use several different measures of implementation and will note these as we review findings.

² In this analysis, evaluators who visited each school approximately once a month assessed the extent to which teachers at the school were using or resisting using the instructional materials. This information came from interviews with teachers, Specialists, and principals.

- Variation with whether schools spoke about OMS Facilitators and Area Coaches as playing significant roles.

Spring 2004 changes in CPS policy and CMSI recommendations

Prior to the February 18, 2003 Chicago Math and Science Initiative Kickoff Press Conference at Galileo Elementary School, CPS leadership supported the Chief Officer of Mathematics and Science by allowing him to provide the time for his staff to engage in a deep understanding of standards-based mathematics and science via the process of a Leadership Academy.³ Thus, when the CMSI was presented to CPS and the public-at-large, CPS leadership stood behind a comprehensive strategic plan that was a voluntary and phased-in approach to encourage schools to adopt and implement standards-based curricula. The plan included supporting 75 Intensive Support schools for the 2003-04 school year by providing the following supports:

- A full-time Math/Science Specialist
- Summer professional development
- Academic year professional development
- \$1000 per classroom for initial purchase of designated instructional materials
- Learning communities
- Online professional development tools

In addition, the CMSI plan included supporting 50 Readiness schools which would receive introductory support and training in 2003-04 and, with adequate progress, would move to Intensive Support standing the following year receiving the same support as Intensive Support schools had in 2003-04. However, this strategically designed plan was only given about five months to operate as planned before it faced new obstacles.

Early in 2004, CPS leadership began to make two sets of policy decisions that affected the CMSI: (1) a new policy insisting that some probation schools adopt CMSI instructional materials and (2) the 2004-05 budget for CMSI. Thus, in early March 2004 OMS found itself needing to adjust the CMSI plan to include adoption of CMSI instructional materials by schools placed on probation. To address these new CMSI adopters, OMS provided Area Instructional Officers with recommendations and guidelines for how the OMS would support the various types of implementing schools and what these schools should include in their SIPAAAs. The inclusion of probation schools into the CMSI plan dramatically altered the OMS's strategy, initially aimed to support an "opt-in" plan where schools would voluntarily choose to implement the CMSI curricula and where an additional 50 new schools would become Readiness schools each year.⁴

On April 2, the Chief Officer of Mathematics and Science sent a letter to Intensive Support school principals informing them of the three major effects of the 2004-05 OMS budget on their schools. Approximately one-quarter of the Intensive support schools were allotted a 50% position for their Specialist.⁵ Secondly, Intensive Support schools received approximately \$700 for CMSI instructional materials per implementing classroom – 30% less per classroom than the previous year. Thirdly, OMS would still provide ongoing professional development for both new and experienced users at the same level of support as originally promised.

In addition to Intensive Support schools, the OMS began the task of contacting Readiness schools to inform them that the level of support that OMS would be able to provide in the 2004-05 year was substantially less than originally planned. The 2004-05 budget did not allow Readiness schools to receive all the promised supports listed above. Instead, Readiness schools would be allowed to attend summer 2004 and school year

³ This unprecedented strategic attempt to develop the human capital and devise the CMSI plan is documented in an earlier evaluation report. See CMSI/CUSP Leadership Academy (August 29, 2003).

⁴ Our data does not include the total number of schools told to implement CMSI materials in 2004-05; however, 69 schools that scored below 40% on the national norms had teachers signed up for CMSI PD in summer 2004 and 109 probation schools were recorded as having purchased CMSI materials for the 2004-05 school year. This is out of a total of 212 schools placed on probation this year.

⁵ Intensive Support schools on probation or schools in a Magnet Cluster Program would be funded for the Specialist at 100%.

2004-05 professional development; however, the school, not OMS, would need to provide stipends for participating teachers.

In sum, OMS had about four months in the spring of 2004 -- the middle of its first year of supporting 125 schools with the original CMSI strategy -- to begin to adjust the Initiative to these two unforeseen policy shifts. This is a marked change from the original 3-4 months where the Leadership Academy's sole focus was on the planning of the Initiative.

Probation schools and implementation of CMSI curricula

The probation schools that have been added into the Initiative through district and Area mandate, as described above, have a unique story and set of needs. During fall 2004, we visited and collected data from a sample of 33 probation schools--roughly 1/3 of the total probation schools in the district. These data suggest that 5 "types" of probation schools are emerging. In brief, this typology categorizes a school by who leads the implementation of CMSI math curricula, how curricular materials are distributed across the school, teacher professional development attendance, school accountability structures for implementation, and the extent to which implementation is taking place.⁶ The distribution across the typology shows probation schools using the following models: 18% with "CMSI Models," 7% with "Push and Pull Models", 14% with "Alternative Specialist Models," 21% with "Laissez Faire Models," and 40% with "Implementation-Free Models." See Table 1 for details on the typology.

Readiness schools and implementation of CMSI curricula

As mentioned above, the CMSI plan was changed mid-stream and supports promised to schools under the original 2003-04 CMSI plan were not the same under the 2004-05 CMSI plan. Perhaps due to this change, we found that of the 48 schools participating as CMSI Readiness schools in 2003-04 only 33 (69%) of these schools chose to adopt CMSI instructional materials in 2004-05. All of the Readiness schools in six of the 18 Elementary Instructional Areas are currently implementing CMSI curricula in some fashion. In the 12 Areas that lost Readiness schools: 4 Areas have no Readiness schools that moved to implementation; 10 Areas lost 1 school; one Area lost 2 schools; one Area lost 4.

In our three Readiness case schools from 2003-04, two moved into implementation this year. Both of these schools do not have a Specialist. Both schools are struggling with organizing materials management and neither has the staff capacity to ensure that all teachers are implementing effectively. One of the two schools is more organized in this respect. In this school, we find that the administration has been thoughtful about what needs to be done for the teachers to find success with the CMSI. In this school we find that teachers are registered for PD and attending PD, that materials have been ordered and teachers have what they need, and that when the administration is unable to help teachers, outside help (OMS Facilitator or Area Coach) are called in to assist. In the struggling school, we are unsure what is happening in terms of implementation. The principal in this school notes the difficulty in getting teachers to buy into a math program when the system is emphasizing literacy. This principal struggles with resisters. When we speak to teachers, 8 of 17 respondents note that they are using the CMSI curricula adopted by the school while 6 each name a different math curricula they are using and 4 teachers refrained from answering the question.

Professional development across all schools implementing CMSI curricula

Analysis of 2003-04 teacher professional development (see Implementation Report C, 2004) revealed some preliminary indications that the "scale-up" of teacher professional development, from serving primarily Intensive Support school teachers to serving a wider range of CPS teachers, needed attention. This became even more important as OMS absorbed teachers in probation schools into teacher professional development. Accommodating this large number of additional teachers had two important implications:

⁶ In this analysis, evaluators who visited each school once or twice during fall of 2004 assessed the extent to which teachers at the school were using or resisting using the instructional materials. This information came primarily from interviews with principals, assistant principals, Specialists, and in a few cases, teachers.

- An increase in the requirement for coordination of logistics like room organization, scheduling of consultants, etc.
- A broadening of the population of teachers participating in the professional development, especially in terms of background and needs.

On the first point, in 2003-04, portions of 4 positions at the Office of Mathematics and Science were devoted to coordinating professional development workshops. This does not include the time of interns and undocumented portions of Facilitator time devoted to it. The unexpected time it took to coordinate these activities meant that staff initially hired to work directly with schools was shifted to focusing on administrative duties in the office. This led to fewer OMS staff members being in the field supporting schools. Reflecting on the strategic use of staff is critical here.

Secondly, workshop format and approach was not designed with such a large number of teachers with such a wide range of backgrounds and needs in mind. The inclusion of this large number of schools on probationary status into the Initiative and, as a result, in teacher training, expanded training needs dramatically. This was unanticipated in initial OMS planning and needs attention.

Preliminary data, from analysis of teacher professional development in 2003-04 and in data collected on a sample of probationary schools in the fall and early winter of 2004 suggest that there is a need to assess the needs of different teacher populations receiving OMS professional development. Data reveals that the teachers attending training who came from Intensive Support schools, who voluntarily applied to implement the materials, have different needs from 2003-04 Readiness schools now implementing, and schools on probation.

Distribution of schools implementing CMSI curricula across Areas and by curricula

Using data provided to us by OMS on which teachers from which schools attended regular summer of 2004 curriculum workshops we examined the variance across Areas and by curricula. Distribution varies widely with Areas housing from 5 to 19 schools using CMSI curricula (representing from 14% to 64% of Area school population); from 0 to 9 Intensive Support schools using CMSI curricula; from 0 to 6 former Readiness schools using CMSI curricula; and from 0 to 11 probation schools using CMSI curricula. Looking across the CMSI curricula, Everyday Math had 106 schools signed up for summer workshops compared to just fewer than 70 schools for each of the other curricula. On average about 60% of the teachers who signed up for workshops attended them. Across the Areas, the percentage of teachers attending to those who registered for workshops ranged from 26% to 78%. Across the primary grade math curricula, Math Trailblazers had 75% of registered teachers attending or 443 teachers and Everyday Math had 51% of registered teachers attending with 420 teachers. Tables 2a, 2b, 2c, and 2d provide detail on these data.

Comments on Coach and Facilitator roles in implementing schools

In the sections that follow, we outline a summary of the data that we have collected on the roles of Coaches and Facilitators in our probation school, Readiness school and Intensive Support school samples. We then consider the role of Specialists in the Intensive Support and probation school sample.⁷

Coaches and Facilitators in probation schools

A sample of thirty-three probation schools considered to be in the process of implementing OMS materials were visited in the fall and early winter of 2004.⁸ We talked with principals, assistant principals, specialists (not necessarily freed or math/science-only) at these 33 schools⁹. We heard from teachers through focus groups and written reflections at 4 probation schools.

⁷ Note that this is preliminary data, collected between September and November 2004 and a sample of probation schools.

⁸ Data was collected at this sample of schools through in-person visits and interviews with 1-2 staff members. We are planning another round of visits to an additional 8-10 probation schools the first week of February. This total of 33 schools reflects the first round of data collection on probation schools.

⁹ In our sample, there were 14 schools listed EM, 10 MTB, 10 MTM and 5 CM.

In general, participants were asked directly about the work of Coaches and Facilitators¹⁰. Based on these data, there were limited reports of Facilitators working with the school. Specifically only one OMS Facilitator was mentioned (at 5 schools) and said to be doing positive work. This Facilitator was reported to provide in-services in which she fielded teachers' questions about implementing the curriculum. When asked, most school staff could not come up with the name of their OMS Facilitator although some say they had met a Facilitator at a Walkthrough.

Based on these data, schools raised the names of two Coaches. At several schools, the reports were very positive about the Coach's work (N=5). The Coach was reported to be providing in-services in which she fielded teachers' questions about implementing the curricula and helped them problem-solve about scheduling so they could find 60 minutes for math. She was mentioned as visiting the school "often," 3-4 times between September and December. This relationship began when the Coach came to the school on a Walkthrough, and then followed up with support. She was giving "face time" at a number of school – we ran into her during our field work at the schools when she was going around touching base with her schools prior to the winter break. Even three "Implementation-Free Model" schools that were not implementing CMSI curricula mentioned that this Coach came around to help them decide which curriculum to adopt. The other Coach who was mentioned in interviews received mixed reviews from one school. Within this school, the administration found this Coach's work positive while the staff reports were negative. Specifically the principal was positive because the Coach was reported to put pressure on the teachers to implement and to provide accountability. The teachers, on the other hand, were upset by the undue pressure as a number of them had not received the materials by the time of the Coach visit; although they reported that these materials were in the building and being held by the administration.

The schools that reported having positive support from a Facilitator generally also spoke of initiating the contact. In one case, the school staff spoke of how they "shopped around" by talking with several people at the Area and OMS until they found someone, in this case a Coach from another area, who they wanted to work with.

Coaches and Facilitators in Readiness schools

The data for this section is taken from our case study schools (N=2). Neither of these schools have a Specialist. At one of the Readiness schools, the principal is very proactive and contacts both the Facilitator and Coach. These two are reported to work well together and to provide useful in-services and to give specific feedback to teachers based on classroom visits. They have also given the principal tools to use for observing classrooms at each grade level.

At the other Readiness school, although the staff does not know much about CMSI some of the teachers have attended professional development and are using CMSI curricula. The teachers and Principal report working with their Coach. Teachers report that the in-services given by their Coach were helpful. The teachers also reported that he was helping them individually. They also mentioned that "someone" from CPS came to give an in-service. The Principal noted that in addition to the Coach the school received in-service help from a Facilitator and another OMS staff member.

Coaches and Facilitators in Intensive Support schools

At our Intensive Support case study schools (N=14), Principals, Specialists and teachers know who their Coach and Facilitator are. They know who to contact for help; however, they are not reporting being actively involved with the Coach and Facilitator early in the fall of 2004. According to informants, Intensive Support schools had expectations that they would see their Facilitators less because of the large number of probation schools the Facilitators were to be supporting in 2004-05. Several Specialists in our sample (3) expressed that they felt they did not need as much Facilitator support this year because implementation was proceeding. The Coach role and the reasons why Coach's have not been involved in IS schools is unclear, although we could speculate that this is because they were not intended to provide much support in IS schools by design in 2003-

¹⁰ It should be noted that the schools visited were in 6 Areas. Therefore we would not expect a large number of Coaches to be listed.

04. We have some concerns that we need additional data on Coach and Facilitator involvement at these schools—particularly later in the school year.

Specialists

In the probation schools we have visited so far, many (N= 16) schools have someone other than the principal designated as a leader though in all but 5 schools they are functioning as curriculum coordinator, professional developer, assistant principal, literacy coordinator, full-time teacher. Only a few of these leaders in the probation school sample (N=5) go to the OMS sponsored Specialist meetings and these report that the meetings do not address their needs. In particular, these new Specialists are primarily new users themselves and report that they would benefit from spending all of their professional development time being trained on the curricula they are to be supporting. In addition, these new Specialists are longing for opportunities to “shadow” experienced Specialists in schools with the same curriculum. They also suggest that videos showing the curriculum being used in CPS classrooms would be helpful, both to increase their understanding of the materials and to use to show teachers in their school that these approaches “work” with CPS children. “The Specialist training assumes we know things we don’t know,” one new Specialist reported. “We are lost most of the time and feel our unique needs are not being addressed,” she stated.

In “Implementation-Free Model” schools a common complaint is that they do not have a freed person to support implementation.

In Readiness schools, neither case study school has a Specialist. One school is hoping to move a literacy coordinator to doing half-time math coordination.

In Intensive Support case study schools, the Specialists are working very actively with teachers. Some are modeling teaching. Some are coordinating supplies. Some are doing “public relations” with school parents and staff to promote the CMSI curricula. Some are attending grade level meetings to work with teachers.

Curriculum Specific Support

The positive reports from schools about support from Coaches, Facilitators, and publishers clustered around those working with one of the CMSI chosen curriculum: Everyday Math. Informants remarked positively about staff, at all levels (including vendors and publishing company 800 numbers), In addition, staff implementing Everyday Math believed it was the easiest curricula for them to transition into.

Discussion of Budget Implications

Key issues of importance as CPS makes budget decisions for the 2005-06 school year include the following that are based on the data summarized above.

On the most promising way to support implementation

CPS should support schools in their first year of implementation of CMSI curricula with a foundation that includes:

- Time for schools to plan budget and SIPAAA decisions around the new implementation
- Positive experiences in ongoing professional development around new curricula
- A supportive principal
- A full-time Specialist who works well with teachers in their classrooms
- Opportunity and support for teacher leaders to emerge and work together.

On CPS policy changes related to implementation of CMSI curricula

Planning and budget schedules at CPS need to better recognize the implications of changes that undercut the credibility of new strategically planned instructional initiatives. Further, they need to recognize the local school calendar process for School Improvement Planning and shared creation of school budgets.

On supporting probation schools implementing

Within probation schools, the roles of Specialist and principal are critical if implementation is to take place. Accordingly, the following issues should be a budget priority.

The skills and training of Specialists are critical. Strong qualities in these Specialists need to be assured.

- OMS or CPS participation in the selection of Specialists for probation schools is a possible mechanism for assuring quality of Specialists.
- Existing OMS Specialist training for the schools that voluntarily entered the Initiative may not be appropriate for these new Specialists who have different backgrounds, situations and needs. Providing support and training for these probation school Specialists should be a priority.
- Schools without a full-time math/science Specialist should consider designating a capable person for this position.

Similarly, principals must be trained in how to understand, monitor and trust CMSI curricular materials.

- Principal training around CMSI curricular materials should be a priority.

Creating an inventory of how **all** probation schools are implementing CMSI materials is necessary to determine the ways in which to support/sanction implementation at probation schools. Collection and use of this data should be a budget priority.

On Readiness schools

Without clear support of school administration and in the absence of a Specialist, OMS needs to devise a plan to support the former Readiness schools. In many respects, this recommendation mirrors those made for probation schools.

On professional development opportunities

OMS staffing around the scheduling and support of professional development workshops should be re-assessed. Is staffing efficient and is there a need to replenish Facilitator positions focused on direct support of schools?

An assessment of the needs of teachers in professional development, both the advanced needs of experienced teachers and those of teachers from probation schools with limited exposure, experience and enthusiasm need to be assessed and varied professional development approaches be designed.

On distribution of schools across Areas and curricula

CPS should factor into budget decisions the distribution of CMSI implementing schools of various sorts across Areas and curricula. These distributions have implications for

- Staffing decisions
- Shaping the work load and professional development needs of Coaches, Facilitators and other professional development providers.

Differences in the rates of teachers attending professional development compared to those who registered offer evidence that CPS may need to better attend to issues of

- Providing incentives or disincentives for teachers' professional development participation
- Supporting principals, Specialists, Coaches and/or Facilitators in recruiting and delivering teachers for these sessions
- Examining in a more formative, real-time fashion the disaggregated attendance rates at sessions underway during the school year.

In sum

The Chicago Math and Science Initiative has rapidly expanded and changed since it was announced in February 2002 as a result of 2004-05 fiscal constraints and inclusion of a large number of schools on probation into the Initiative. Given this, we believe that OMS is justified in asking for substantial amounts of additional funding to support the Initiative. The addition of probation schools has literally doubled the size of the Initiative, which has been expected to function on the same level of funds as the previous year. The needs of probation schools have been documented to be fundamentally different from Intensive Support schools which voluntarily entered

into the implementation of new math or science materials. The expansion of the logistical organization of increased professional development alone is justification for new staffing, not to mention the need for additional support in probation schools struggling to implement without appropriate training or guidance. At the same time, increased funding should come with willingness on the part of OMS to assess and consider reorganization of staff and professional development opportunities to better address the needs of this Initiative. Data reveals the need to revisit Facilitator and Area Coach roles, the design of teacher professional development and the re-alignment of CMSI goals and OMS operations.

Table 1	Types of Probation Schools Using CMSI Materials, 1/10/05
Table 2a	Area Distribution of Schools Using CMSI-Supported Curricular Materials in 2004-2005, Per Registration at Summer 2004 Professional Development
Table 2b	Curriculum Distribution of Schools Using CMSI-Supported Curricular Materials in 2004-2005, Per Registration at Summer 2004 Professional Development
Table 2c	Area Level View of Attendance Rate for Probation Schools at Summer 2004 Professional Development in CMSI-Supported Curricular Materials
Table 2d	Curriculum Level View of Attendance Rate at Summer 2004 Professional Development in CMSI0-Supported Curricular Materials

Table 1: Types of Probation Schools Using CMSI Materials, 1/10/05

	Leadership in Math Implementation	Materials	Professional Development	Accountability	Implementation	Percentage of Case Study Schools
“CMSI” Model	“Mentor” Specialist	Full materials or strategic partial	Implementing teachers attending	Specialist monitoring of implementation	Full or strategic partial implementation;	18%
“Push and Pull Model”	Specialist uses a “pull out” method to provide students with additional math support	Full materials or strategic partial	Implementing teachers attending	Little or no monitoring of implementation	Full or strategic partial implementation with additional pull-out	7%
Other “Alternative Specialist” Models	Specialist is a Curriculum Coordinator, Literacy Coordinator or part/full time teacher	Full materials or strategic partial	Implementing teachers attending	Little or no monitoring of implementation	Full or strategic partial implementation	14%
“Laissez-Faire” Model	Assistant Principal and/or Principal	Materials in building	Partial or voluntary attendance	Little or no monitoring of implementation	Implementation depth and quality uncertain	21%
“Implementation-Free” Model	None. May have Coordinator or Specialist but not focused on CMSI materials	Materials not in classrooms or not purchased	No attendance	No monitoring of implementation	No implementation	40%

Table 2a: Area Distribution of Schools Using CMSI-Supported Curricular Materials in 2004-2005, Per Registration at Summer 2004 Professional Development

Area	# Total Schools	# Total Probation Schools	# Total Schools Listed as CMSI Curricula Users	% Total Schools Listed as CMSI Curricula Users	# Schools Probation School Listed as CMSI Curricula Users	% Schools Probation School Listed as CMSI Curricula Users	# Voluntary Schools (Non-Readiness, Non-Intensive Support) Listed as	# Former Readiness Schools Listed as CMSI Curricula	# Intensive Support Schools Listed as CMSI Curricula
1	44	0	14	32%	0	--	5	0	9
2	41	3	14	34%	1	33%	6	1	6
3	22	15	7	32%	2	13%	1	1	3
4	23	11	13	57%	6	55%	1	4	2
5	23	7	12	52%	4	57%	5	1	2
6	25	7	15	60%	6	86%	6	0	3
7	22	14	14	64%	5	36%	3	4	2
8	27	19	10	37%	2	11%	1	4	3
9	31	4	14	45%	3	75%	3	3	5
10	26	4	14	54%	3	75%	3	2	6
11	29	5	10	34%	4	80%	1	1	4
12	30	14	18	60%	11	79%	4	1	2
13	22	15	12	55%	2	13%	2	2	6
14	28	23	12	43%	10	43%	0	2	0
15	24	12	8	33%	2	17%	4	0	2
16	35	10	5	14%	3	30%	0	0	0
17	37	14	19	51%	4	29%	4	6	5
18	38	18	15	39%	1	6%	8	1	5
Total	527	195	226		69		57	33	65
Average per Area	29	11	13	44%	4	43%	3	2	4

Table 2b: Curriculum Distribution of Schools Using CMSI-Supported Curricular Materials in 2004-2005, Per Registration at Summer 2004 Professional Development

	# Total Schools Listed as CMSI Curricula Users	# Schools Probation School Listed as CMSI Curricula Users	# Voluntary Schools (Non-Readiness, Non-Intensive Support) Listed as CMSI Curricula Users	# Former Readiness Schools Listed as CMSI Curricula Users	# Intensive Support Schools Listed as CMSI Curricula Users
Everyday Math	106	29	28	15	34
Math Trailblazers	66	20	20	9	17
Connected Math	66	18	17	8	23
Math Thematics	69	18	17	10	24
Science	68	22	20	5	21
Total	375	107	102	47	119
Average per Curriculum	75	21	20	9	24

Table 2c: Area Level View of Attendance Rate for Probation Schools at Summer 2004 Professional Development in CMSI-Supported Curricular Materials

Area	Probation CMSI Summer PD Total Registered Teachers	Probation CMSI Summer PD Total Attendance of Teachers	Probation CMSI Summer PD Percentage for Teachers	CMSI Summer PD Total Registered Teachers	CMSI Summer PD Total Attendance of Teachers	CMSI Summer PD Percentage for Teachers
1	0	0	0%	170	109	64%
2	0	0	0%	126	89	71%
3	18	11	61%	95	53	56%
4	78	55	71%	187	136	73%
5	51	26	51%	101	61	60%
6	31	26	84%	126	71	56%
7	50	30	60%	144	83	58%
8	11	5	45%	70	35	50%
9	37	17	46%	178	115	65%
10	26	12	46%	181	122	67%
11	55	45	82%	155	117	75%
12	169	120	71%	269	178	66%
13	17	10	59%	106	48	45%
14	81	46	57%	104	63	61%
15	4	0	0%	54	42	78%
16	6	3	50%	45	19	42%
17	10	3	30%	151	81	54%
18	1	0	0%	175	46	26%
Total	645	409		2437	1468	
Average per Area	36	23	45%	135	82	59%

Table 2d: Curriculum Level View of Attendance Rate at Summer 2004 Professional Development in CMSI-Supported Curricular Materials

	CMSI Summer PD Total Registered Teachers	CMSI Summer PD Total Attendance of Teachers	CMSI Summer PD Percentage for Teachers	Probation CMSI Summer PD Total Registered Teachers	Probation CMSI Summer PD Total Attendance of Teachers	Probation CMSI Summer PD Percentage for Teachers
Everyday Math	827	420	51%	233	135	58%
Math Trailblazers	592	443	75%	191	147	78%
Connected Math	214	123	57%	59	39	66%
Math Thematics	263	126	47%	69	34	49%
Science	515	346	67%	113	65	58%
Total	2411	1458		665	420	
Average per Curriculum	482	292	59%	133	84	62%