

A first look at teachers' descriptions of their use of CMSI curricula

A Report for the CPS Office of Mathematics and Science
Prepared by the PRAIRIE Group, UIC College of Education

November 22, 2006

Meghan Burke **
Carol R. Fendt
Janise Hurtig
Lisa Raphael-Bogaert
Stacy A. Wenzel

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

** Authors are listed alphabetically and produced this report collaboratively. They share responsibility for its contents equally. 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.

A first look at teachers' descriptions of their use of CMSI curricula

This report has been prepared with the goal of informing the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) Office of Math and Science (OMS) about classroom math instruction, as it continues to implement the Chicago Math and Science Initiative (CMSI), a comprehensive program begun in 2003 and aimed at improving math and science education in elementary schools (grades K-8). The audience for this report is the OMS leadership team.

While the audience for this report is the OMS leadership team, it is true also that we have specifically been asked to help shed light on how teachers interact with, use, and think about the CMSI-supported curricula. We acknowledge that looking closely at teachers' practice in this manner potentially sets up an unequal power dynamic that may challenge the view of teachers as professionals. The authors of this report have tried conscientiously to prevent that from happening here and remind our readers to be cognizant of the multifaceted influences on teachers' work. We acknowledge too that this report just begins to touch the surface of teachers' thinking about their use of CMSI-supported curricula. In addition, the authors would like to thank the many teachers who shared their views that we describe below and hope that we have heard and represented you well. Thanks to those school staff members who graciously arranged for us to speak with teachers within their school meeting times.

Overview

The purpose of this report is to share findings about how and why teachers teach math and use CMSI-supported curricula. The findings are based on CPS teachers' self reports regarding their teaching of math, their use of CMSI-supported curricula, their reasons for using or not using those curricula in their classrooms. Data upon which these initial findings are based were collected September through November 2006. Seventy-two teachers were interviewed at their eight schools either in focus group settings or individually in the case of a few teachers. These teachers also completed short background surveys.¹ An additional 19 teachers from one school did not interview but completed short written reflection forms along with the short background survey. The protocol was modified for this school because on the day made available to meet teachers there was only enough time for them to fill out short surveys and not enough to conduct focus groups.

Table 1 *School Characteristics* summarizes the grades and population of students the teachers in this sample were teaching. Only three of the 91 teachers were first-year teachers. The majority of teachers in the sample were teaching K-5 regular education students. The others were teaching regular middle grades, special education and bilingual students. Approximately one-half of the teachers teaching math in these nine schools participated in this study though all were invited to participate. The participation rate varied by school from 25% to over 90% of math teachers in the school.

¹ Background surveys were tailored according to which math curriculum was taught at a school. These surveys were created in consultation of professional development experts who work with these curricula as part of the CMSI. Copies of the four survey protocols are attached at the end of this report.

Table 1: School Characteristics

School	Sample						School Population			
	Number first year teachers	Number of primary teachers (K-5)	Number of middle grades teachers (6-8)	Number of K-8 Sp Ed teachers	Number of K-8 Bilingual teachers	Total teachers in sample	Number of Reg K-8 teachers of math per school	Number of K-8 Sp Ed teachers per school.	Total teachers of math per school	Percent of school's math teachers in sample
A	0	5	1	0	0	7	19	4	23	30%
B	0	5	2	0	3	7	18	3	21	33%
C	0	6	0	1	0	7	19	3	22	32%
D	1	6	3	3	0	11	22	4	26	42%
E	1	11	2	2	0	18	19	3	22	82%
F~	1	15	3	1	0	19	*16	*4	*20	*95%
G	0	5	0	0	0	10	13	3	16	63%
H	0	0	2	3	4	8	*6	*10	*16	*50%
I	0	3	0	0	0	4	14	2	16	25%
Total	3	57	13	10	7	91	146	36	182	50%

~ School staff filled out written reflections, did not participate in focus group discussion.

* Approximate number estimated based on 2005-06 data.

The characteristics of these schools mirror typical CPS elementary schools using CMSI-supported curricula. As the OMS leadership team will recall, schools for this study come from 11 of the 17 Areas of the district, representing the multiple configurations of CMSI curricula in use at each school, and representing the multiple ways CMSI has been adopted in schools over the last four years. Of 13 case study schools, this report is based on data collected from nine of these schools over a two-month period this fall. Of these nine schools, five have been in the study for the last four years: two of these have been former Readiness schools (both with in-school specialists this year); the other three, Intensive Support schools (one having an in-school specialist this year). Two of the nine schools joined the study in the second year as probation schools mandated to implement CMSI. One of these has an in-school specialist. Two other schools began implementing last year. Both had in-school support from city-wide specialists last year. This year, neither has a city-wide specialist, but one has an in-school specialist.

The 91 teachers completing background information sheets reported their backgrounds in terms of their history of teaching experiences. Table 2 below, *Teacher Characteristics by Curriculum* summarizes teacher backgrounds aggregated by which CMSI-supported curriculum used at their school. Of the 91 teachers, the majority had been at their present schools for more than three years and had been teaching the curriculum for over a year. Also, the majority of teachers had at least three years of teaching experience. As previously noted, two of the nine schools have used the CMSI-supported curricula for just under two years. The other seven are in their third or fourth year of implementation.

Table 2: Teacher Characteristics by Curriculum

Curriculum used	Number of teachers reporting	Mean years teaching at school	Mean years teaching this curriculum	Mean years teaching
Everyday Math	43	6.0	2.2	11.1 (SD = 8.1)
Math Trailblazers	22	8.4	3.7	16.8 (SD = 9.8)
Connected Math	12	5.5	2.3	11.3 (SD = 8.2)
Math Thematics	14	3.8	1.4	14.5 (SD = 10.0)

Findings: How and why teachers teach math using CMSI-supported curricula

The purpose of the fall 2006 focus group interviews was to elicit discussion from teachers about two primary themes: (1) How they teach math in light of the expectation that they use a CMSI curriculum. (2) Why they make the choices they do in their teaching of math generally, and particularly as they implement the CMSI-supported curricula. There is great nuance in terms of teachers' descriptions of their math teaching, their specific use of CMSI curricula, and the rationale they give or explanations they offer for their instructional practices. Continued analysis of these data will examine the relationship between facets of use and rationale for use more deeply and will bring additional contextual factors to bear on the analysis. In this report we share some interim findings from the data collected, illustrating the variability and complexity of how and why teachers approach math in the ways they do.

How.

The far left column in Table 3 outlines the types of choices teachers made around teaching math using CMSI-supported curricula. We find these choices clustered around four major categories.

- Supplement
- Skip
- Modify
- Use as is

We define supplement as those cases where teachers choose to add to the CMSI curricula with non-CMSI related activities, worksheets, or lessons. Generally, these additions to the CMSI curricula have taken the form of activities used to develop students' basic skills and/or to prepare students for the ISAT. The term skip describes parts of or aspects of the CMSI curricula that teachers choose not to implement. Teachers have described this as skipping particular daily activities within a lesson such as "warm ups" or not allowing students to use manipulatives and/or skipping entire lessons. We define modify as those cases in which teachers adapt the curricula. Often this is to meet their perceptions of students' needs: for example, teaching students "mini" lessons within a lesson to ensure students understand all the concepts included in the curriculum's lessons or taking additional days after a chapter to study for a test or to have students correct their mistakes on a test. Those cases where teachers choose to use the curricula as is fall within the final category. Within this category are examples of activities or aspects of curricula that teachers use according to what they believe is the intention of the curricula creators.

Why.

In the focus group discussions teachers not only described how they taught, they frequently described the rationale guiding their choices. In our analysis, we found that for each type of math curricula use, there were a few reasons for the use that many teachers shared. In Table 3, the various categories of reasons appear as column headings for the table. We color-coded the rationales in Table 3 to reflect an early finding that these rationales cluster around several major themes:

- Curriculum (pink)
- Students (orange)
- Teaching practice and experience (yellow)
- ISAT testing (green)
- Resources: Time, class size, materials (blue)
- Parents (purple).

We use curriculum to refer to teachers' ideas about what is included within the curricula and how the curricula were formatted and arranged. Generally, teachers expressed what the curricula were missing and/or what they saw as the strength of a given curriculum. Students describes the occasions where teachers attributed their teaching of math to the characteristics of their students, usually when they saw their students as lacking skills. Teacher practice and experience includes rationales in which the teachers reflected on how they made choices based on their judgment as professionals and/or their past experience teaching with the curriculum. For example, some teachers explained that they needed to differentiate instruction to meet the variation in students' needs. Others spoke of how they fell behind in teaching the lessons according to the targeted pacing. The ISAT testing rationale was used often and encompassed how teachers shape their instruction to match what they believed their students had to learn for the test. The

resources teachers had available to them were also a frequent reason given for some teaching choices. Whether a teacher had a full 60 minutes a day for teaching math or had enough workbooks for each student made a difference in how they shaped their use of CMSI-supported curricula. Finally, teachers also had some strong beliefs about parents' role in math instruction and made some of these views clear during focus groups. For example, some teachers modified homework assignments based on the perception that parents would not or could not assist their children with the CMSI-supported homework assignments.

Table 3: Teachers' use by their rationale for use

Use	Rationale									
In addition to using CMSI curriculum, I SUPPLEMENT with extra non-CMSI worksheets or lessons focused on	The CMSI curriculum doesn't include enough of this	My students are very low achievers (or have special needs) and need extra help with this	As I differentiate for my varied students, some need more of this	The CMSI curriculum is new to me; I did not know how to cover this without supplementing	There are topics that need to be taught by a certain time given what will be on the ISAT					
...basic skills (general)	Example A									
...problems for student practice										
...information needed for ISAT (general)										
...extended response										
...graphing										
...own "problem of the day"										
...another math topic (i.e. Integers)										
While I teach other parts of the CMSI curriculum, I often SKIP these parts...	I have trouble with managing students' classroom behavior	Some of material covered in the curriculum is confusing to me	I focus on what will be on their homework	When I last taught this part, it was a disaster	I fall behind in pacing and covering the material (even if I have 60 min/day)	There are topics that need to be taught by a certain time given what will be on the ISAT	I cannot cover all the material in time allotted (which is less than 60 min/day)	I do not have enough materials for all of my students	The size of my class is too large	
...whole lesson										
...a subset of concepts from within a lesson										
...examples like...warm-ups, Adventure books, games										
...involving group work	Example C									Example B
...involving manipulatives										
...using on-line pacing guide suggestions for what can be skipped		Example D								
...parts of lesson considered optional										

Table 3 continued

Use	Rationale						
I MODIFY this facet of CMSI curriculum ...	I like the depth of understanding it promotes	Too many concepts per lesson	My students don't know basic skills	My students are very low achievers (or have special needs/ELL learners) and need extra help with this	I fall behind in pacing and covering the material (even if I have 60 min/day)	I cannot cover all the material in time allotted (which is less than 60 min/day)	Parents cannot help or parents would do the homework for students
...adding a day to review before exam and/or add a day to correct the exam answers	<i>Example E</i>						
...take additional time to cover topics to break down concepts step by step							
...tools for students to refer to if they don't know basic skills (i.e. multiplication table at their desk or posted in the room)							
...teaching students in Spanish first then in English							
...having students do the "homework" in class							
...teach students only parts of lesson according to what concepts are included in the "homework"							
I USE this facet of CMSI curriculum as is...	I like the depth of understanding it promotes	I see it helping students develop problem solving skills	I see it helping students develop the ability to work independently and maturely	The curriculum is highly scripted and if you have the materials, you need to follow it closely	The students have some positive experience doing this type of exercise before	We are encouraged to "trust" the curriculum	
...general "use the program as is"							
...reading the opening story before the lesson							
...group work	<i>Example C</i>						
... "spiraling"							
... games							
...assessments in curriculum							
...multiple methods to problem solving							

Table 3 contains a great deal of information about how teachers described and explained their use of CMSI-supported curricula. It is meant as an initial cut of an ongoing analysis. It is not meant to provide a comprehensive list of all ways of describing use of curricula nor all rationales for why teachers do what they do. These findings can be used to ground future dialogue in empirical data. However, these early findings do offer illuminating ways of framing the issues around the implementation of CMSI-supported math curricula in CPS. A few examples of these issues follow. The sites on Table 3 related to these examples are marked accordingly on the table. As these examples show, the focus groups not only shed light on teachers' view of and beliefs about the curricula, they also shed some light on key CMSI supports:/constraints access to materials, professional development, grade-level math meetings, specialist/Area/ OMS support, and CMSI within special education classrooms.

Example A: Supplementing basic skills and practice not included within the four curricula.

Teachers from schools using four math curricula spoke of the importance they placed on supplementing the CMSI-supported materials with worksheets or activities to better cover basic skills. They gave the rationale that supplementing was needed because the CMSI-supported curriculum they used did not cover the basic skills their students did not yet have. Many of these teachers also explained that the curricular materials did not include enough practice problems for students to work at honing basic skills.

This example poses interesting questions about what teachers understand about the purpose and philosophy of the curricula they use. All four of the math curricula include components that their authors would say offer students a chance to practice basic skills, such as computation. For example in Everyday Math, the Games offer these opportunities. Yet only 20 of the 43 Everyday Math teachers in this study said their students played the games at least one time a week.

Example B: Skipping parts because lacking time or materials.

While at some schools the time and materials are available to teachers for using the CMSI-supported math curricula, at others there was still a lack of resources. Some teachers gave the lack of resources as their rationale for skipping parts of the curricula. While the vast majority of the teachers in the sample reported they taught math for 60 minutes or more a day, 24% of the teachers reported they taught between 40 and 59 minutes a day. Across the four curricula, 73% of the 91 teachers in this study said that their students each had their own math book or guide. However, Math Trailblazer teachers were also asked if students had their own Discover Book, and only five of 22 teachers said each student did. Nine of the 12 Connected Math teachers in the sample reported their students had their own calculators to use in class.

As external evaluation reports in the past also have noted, some teachers (not just Special Education teachers) did not have access to all recommended curricular materials. Findings indicate that access to materials varied across schools and grade levels. In some cases, information contradicted information supplied by their administrator and/or specialist. The persistence of challenges surrounding resources highlights the need for additional dialogue and action by CMSI leaders and the need for future data collection.

Example C: Skipping group work due to student behavior but also seeing it as a strength of the curricula and using it as is.

While the CMSI-supported math curricula all call for students to work in small groups from time to time, some teachers explained that they chose to skip group work activities if students misbehaved too much in these groups. Yet, other teachers reported that they specifically used group activities as suggested in the curricula because group activities were particularly good at helping students develop problem solving skills and the ability to work independently. This independent work was especially important for some teachers hoping to prepare their middle grades students for high school. Sixty-seven of 91 teachers in the study reported that their students did math group work at least once a week.

These examples point to variations in teachers' rationales about when and what to skip. These examples pose an opportunity for teachers, CMSI leaders, and CMSI curricula providers to further clarify and discuss aspects of the curricula that tend to be skipped and/or ways to modify activities or lessons to fit the situations teachers face in their classrooms.

Example D: Trying to keep pace and to cover all content

Teachers across schools and curricula spoke about pacing in terms of the time or lack of time they have to cover the math curricula. Some also spoke about their use of the CMSI pacing chart. Some teachers reported that they turned to the chart to help them plan their lessons or decide what lessons were important to teach. For example, a few teachers were thrilled to see that certain problematic areas of the curriculum were not being promoted on the CMSI pacing chart. They felt this supported their own professional judgments that some lessons or aspects of lessons were not as beneficial as others and in the interest of keeping the pace could be skipped.

Pacing continues to pose a difficulty for teachers. Some feel torn between wanting students to master concepts or all elements of a lesson before moving on to the next lesson and completing a lesson a day. Others want to “trust” the spiraling but see their students floundering like fish out of water. In schools where one or both of these are true, teachers hunger for confirmation about which produces the better results for students.

Example E: Modification

Teachers at all nine schools and across grade levels described ways in which they modified the CMSI curricula. They did so in order to teach math more effectively to their students. In many cases teachers modified in ways they believed maintained the spirit of the curriculum’s intentions. For example, a number of teachers in this study noted that they used more than the allotted 60 minutes of math time to get through lessons. Another way in which teachers reported modifying the curricula revolved around homework assignments. Some teachers reported modifying the homework assignments in ways that were meant to facilitate students’ ability to complete the assignments, get help from their parents, and/or get additional practice in basic or other skills. For example, teachers described modifying the content of the homework—simplifying the language or using pictures rather than words—in order to accommodate the reading levels of their students. Other teachers were selective about what homework they gave, either because they felt the parents did too much of the homework or the parents were unable or unwilling to help sufficiently with homework assignments. Finally, teachers varied as to whether they reviewed homework in class or not, basing their decisions on such factors as whether they felt they had time during class to do so, whether they identified that most of their students were getting the concepts, or whether they considered the homework problem to be a key aspect of the unit.

As with all of the sections above, teachers shared a genuine desire to do what was right by their students. In doing this, teachers believe it is their professional duty to modify the curricula in ways that will produce the most successful results for their students. Here, again, we heard teachers describe their rationale for making modifications based on their beliefs about their students.

Moving toward use – Actionable contexts

A number of issues related to professional development emerged in the focus groups. Some teachers noted their inability to access professional development based on school-level constraints. Those who did attend workshops reported varying degrees of usefulness in relation to their practice. Other issues that may merit additional research include “misinformation” surrounding the curricula and its use, topics teachers wished workshops would cover, and teachers’ lack of familiarity with all of the materials available to them in the curricula.

Across schools, grade levels, and curricula, teachers’ abilities to meet together regularly for reflection and planning related to math teaching and curricula varied widely. Some teachers discussed their lessons daily with each other, while others talked for the first time with each other about their lessons during our focus group with them. Some identified scheduling difficulties as reasons for their inability to meet; others, who officially had time to meet, noted that this time was whittled away or usurped by other priorities at the school. Even within the groups that did meet, there was variation in the reported usefulness of these meetings. Some teachers noted their desire to meet in both grade levels and cross-grade levels in order to

better understand how the spiraling of the curricula happens year-to-year and to work closer in tandem with colleagues.

Teachers across the sample had mixed views of the support they received or wished they were receiving from in-school specialists. Five of the schools in this sample had a math specialist, while four schools either had one in the past but no longer have one or never had one. According to the teachers, the role of the specialists in these schools varied. Some teachers (both with and without a specialist) wished they had a specialist knowledgeable about math who could observe their math lessons and/or co-teach with them or model lessons. Some noted how specialists were instrumental in getting them signed up for PD, getting the substitute teachers, and reminding them to attend. Others reported that their specialist had been instrumental in ordering supplies; with the loss of this position or the loss of the specialist's ability to act in this capacity, the school lacked necessary materials and instruction suffered as a result. A few teachers described the influence of the Area in terms of what they were expecting to "see" in the classrooms and how this was sometimes at odds with what teachers were able to do when trying to teach the CMSI-supported curricula in their classrooms.

Data from the focus groups conducted indicate that special education teachers continued to face obstacles in their math instruction using CMSI supported curricula specific to their situations. Ten special education teachers reported that they had inadequate quantities or incomplete sets of materials for CMSI implementation. As a result of the lack of materials in these classrooms, special education teachers were forced to try to borrow materials from other classrooms or to skip activities entirely in their math instruction. In terms of the use of manipulatives, special education teachers reported challenges similar to some regular education teachers; in particular, they commented that the manipulatives were often distracting to their students and occasionally used as "weapons" in their classrooms rather than as learning tools.

Use of CMSI supported curricula in special education classrooms varied across the nine schools from which we collected data. In one school, the special education teachers were mandated by the administration to solely rely upon the CMSI supported curriculum. However, this school was the exception. In the remaining schools, special education teachers were left to freely decide whether to use the CMSI supported curricula without any guidance from the administration or CMSI leaders. Regardless of the nature or extent of the school administration's direction regarding the use of CMSI supported curricula, all special education teachers reported that they supplement their math instruction with non-CMSI materials. While the specific kind of supplementing varied, in all cases it was based on what the special education teachers perceived to be their students' needs and abilities. All of the special education teachers reported that they "break down" their math lessons into "smaller steps" so their children can understand the math concepts. The teachers reported that they modify their math instruction so they could present math concepts using a "piecemeal" approach.

We end this report noting that what we have shared above only begins to touch on the surface of teachers' understanding of their math instruction using the CMSI curricula. Each time we revisit our conversations with teachers this fall we come away with more questions of the nuances of their work and the supports necessary to do that well. There is much in these conversations for CMSI leaders to think about. We encourage CMSI leaders and curricula providers to continue to work together to provide teachers with all possible supports for them to continue to teach their students well.

Attachments: Four Background Information Teacher Surveys

Background Information
School Name/ID #

Classroom Information:

Grade(s)/Content Area taught:

Do you teach split grades? If so, which ones?

Do you teach a **Self-contained** classroom or are your classes **departmentalized**? (Please circle)

___ How many minutes of Math instruction per **week**?

___ How many minutes of Science instruction per **week**?

Is this an ELL/Bilingual Classroom? ___ Yes ___ No

If not, do you have ELL/Bilingual students **in your classroom for math**?

Is this a Special Education Self-contained classroom? ___ Yes ___ No

If not, do you have students with disabilities **in your classroom for math**?

Teacher Background:

Number of years teaching: _____

Number of years at this school: _____

Number of years using the **Math Thematics** curricula: _____

Which of the following Professional Development sessions have you attended related to the **Math Thematics** curricula?

___ Summer PD

___ New user PD

___ Experienced user PD

___ National PD given by the curriculum provider

Are you endorsed in mathematics &/or science? ___No ___ Yes If yes, which endorsements do you have? _____

Are you taking classes towards endorsement? ___No ___ Yes Which? _____

Use of Curricula Information:

Do each of your students have their own Student Book? ___ Yes ___ No

Do each of your students have their own Student Workbook? ___Yes ___ No

Do you have the Teacher Resource Book (TRB)? ___Yes ___No

Please circle the appropriate frequency of your use of the following materials and practices:

Math Thematics Student Books	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Math Thematics Student Workbooks (explorations lab sheets, practice and application, and key concepts)	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students work with partners or small group	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students do "check points."	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students do "warm ups"	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
You talk with your colleagues about student performance on the Benchmark Assessments for Math (Learning First for Math)	Often	3 times/year	1 or 2 times/year	Never-rarely

Future follow up opportunities:

- Would you be willing to talk with us and let us observe your math classroom to help us clarify what we are learning? ___Yes ___No
- If so, what is our best way to reach you?

Name: _____ Email address: _____

Phone number: _____

Background Information
School Name/ID # _____

Classroom Information:

Grade(s)/Content Area taught: _____

Do you teach split grades? If so, which ones? _____

Self-contained classroom or departmentalized? (Circle one)

___ Minutes of Math instruction per week?

___ Minutes of Science instruction per week?

Is this an ELL/Bilingual Classroom? ___ Yes ___ No

If not, do you have ELL/Bilingual students in your classroom for math? ___ Yes ___ No

Is this a Special Education Self-contained classroom? ___ Yes ___ No

If not, do you have students with disabilities in your classroom for math? ___ Yes ___ No

Teacher Background:

Number of years teaching: _____

Number of years at this school: _____

Number of years using the **Everyday Math** curriculum: _____

Which of the following Professional Development sessions have you attended related to the **Everyday Math** curriculum? (Check all that apply)

___ Summer PD

___ New user PD

___ Experienced user PD

___ National PD given by the curriculum provider

Are you endorsed in mathematics &/or science? (please circle which one) _____

Are you taking classes towards endorsement? (if so, for what area?) _____

Use of Curricula Information:

Does each of your students have their own student book/workbook? ___ Yes ___ No

Do you have your own teacher resource materials? ___ Yes ___ No (Which materials are you lacking?) _____

Curricula Information. Please check the appropriate frequency of your use of the following materials:

Students do Everyday Math "Math Messages"	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students use the Math manipulatives	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students work with partners or small group	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students complete assessments (e.g. assessment pages, quizzes, observational assessment, unit tests, math journals, facts quizzes, etc.)	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students use the Everyday Math student text/workbook	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students take CPS Benchmark Assessments for Mathematics	Often	3 times/year	1 or 2 times/year	Never-rarely
Students play the Everyday Math games	3-5 times/week	1-2 times/week	1-2 times/month	Never-rarely
Students use additional supplemental materials (for example, non-CMSI curricular skill sheets, Math Facts, Times Tables, etc.)	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____

Possible Follow-Up Opportunities:

Would you be willing to talk with us and let us observe your math classroom to help us clarify what we are learning? ___ Yes ___ No

If so, what is our best way to reach you?

Name: _____

Phone number: _____

Email address: _____

Background Information
School Name/ID #

Classroom Information:

Grade(s)/Content Area taught: _____

Do you teach split grades? If so, which ones? _____

Self-contained classroom or departmentalized? (*Circle one*)

___ Minutes of Math instruction per week?

___ Minutes of Science instruction per week?

Is this an ELL/Bilingual Classroom? ___ Yes ___ No

If not, do you have ELL/Bilingual students in your classroom for math? ___ Yes ___ No

Is this a Special Education Self-contained classroom? ___ Yes ___ No

If not, do you have students with disabilities in your classroom for math? ___ Yes ___ No

Teacher Background:

Number of years teaching: _____

Number of years at this school: _____

Number of years using the **Math Trailblazers** curriculum: _____

Which of the following Professional Development sessions have you attended related to the **Math Trailblazers** curriculum? (*Check all that apply*)

___ Summer PD

___ New user PD

___ Experienced user PD

___ National PD given by the curriculum provider

Are you endorsed in mathematics &/or science? _____

Are you taking classes towards endorsement? _____

Use of Curricula Information:

Does each of your students have their own Student Guide (SG)? ___ Yes ___ No

Does each of your students have access to their own Discover Assignment Book (DAB)? ___ Yes ___ No

Please circle the appropriate frequency of your use of the following materials and practices:

Daily Practice Problems (DPPs)	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students use the Math manipulatives	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students work with partners or small group	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students complete assessments (e.g. assessment pages, DPP quizzes, observational assessment, unit tests, portfolios, math journals, facts quizzes, etc.)	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students use the Student Guides (SGs)	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students take CPS Benchmark Assessments for Mathematics	Often	3 times/year	1 or 2 times/year	Never-rarely

Possible Follow-Up Opportunities:

Would you be willing to talk with us and let us observe your math classroom to help us clarify what we are learning? ___ Yes ___ No

If so, what is our best way to reach you?

Name: _____

Phone number: _____

Email address: _____

Background Information
School Name/ID #

Classroom Information:

Grade(s)/Content Area taught: _____

Do you teach split grades? If so, which ones? _____

Self-contained classroom or departmentalized? (*Circle one*)

___ Minutes of Math instruction per week?

___ Minutes of Science instruction per week?

Is this an ELL/Bilingual Classroom? ___ Yes ___ No

If not, do you have ELL/Bilingual students in your classroom for math? ___ Yes ___ No

Is this a Special Education Self-contained classroom? ___ Yes ___ No

If not, do you have students with disabilities in your classroom for math? ___ Yes ___ No

Teacher Background:

Number of years teaching: _____

Number of years at this school: _____

Number of years using the **Connected Math** curricula: _____

Which of the following Professional Development sessions have you attended related to the **Connected Math** curricula? (*Check all that apply*)

___ Summer PD

___ New user PD

___ Experienced user PD

___ National PD given by the curriculum provider

Are you endorsed in mathematics &/or science? _____

Are you taking classes towards endorsement? _____

Use of Curricula Information:

Does each of your students have their own Student Book? ___ Yes ___ No

Does each of your students have access to a calculator when needed for math? ___ Yes ___ No

Please circle the appropriate frequency of your use of the following materials and practices:

Connected Math Student Books	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Math manipulatives	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students work with partners or small group	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students take CMP Quizzes with partners	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students work on Extended Response problems from non-CMP materials	Daily	3-4 times/week	1-2 times/week	Other _____
Students take CPS Benchmark Assessments for Mathematics	Often	3 times/year	1 or 2 times/year	Never-rarely

Possible Follow-Up Opportunities:

Would you be willing to talk with us and let us observe your math classroom to help us clarify what we are learning? ___ Yes ___ No

If so, what is our best way to reach you?

Name: _____

Phone number: _____

Email address: _____