

McGraw Hill appreciates the careful approach EdReports took in reviewing *Everyday Mathematics 4* ©2020 and we are proud that the reviewers have verified strengths of the program.

Everyday Mathematics offers a unique, research-based approach and has been identified as the most effective core elementary math program available by the U.S. Department of Education. The program has features designed to help teachers guide instruction in their classroom and make instructional decisions based on the needs of their students. The materials provide student-centered instruction with multiple pathways for students to approach learning which supports equity in the classroom and encourages positive attitudes about mathematics.

The flexibility these features offer is one of the reasons the program is so effective, but it can make it challenging to measure the program against a rubric, such as the one used by EdReports, which is designed to evaluate materials against a set of standards that do not allow for a high degree of flexibility.

We believe the EdReports reviewers overcame this challenge on almost every part of the review of Gateways 1 and 2, however there are three indicators about which we have concerns that have not been addressed. These concerns are outlined below.

We continue to work with the EdReports team to clarify the indicators for which we have concerns to ensure that the review of *Everyday Mathematics* accurately reflects the strengths of the program.

SHIFTING REQUIREMENTS FOR CRITERA

The requirement for independent application of non-routine problems in the review of indicator 2c was introduced in the response to the counter evidence we submitted. This requirement did not appear as a concern in the draft review, it is not identified as a requirement in the evidence guide, and it does not appear in reviews of other programs, so we did not provide examples in our counter evidence that meet this requirement. This means that we have not been afforded the opportunity to fully rebut the findings of the reviewers on indicator 2c.

LACK OF CLARITY

The review for indicator 2c includes contradictory statements. The review says, “*Everyday Mathematics* provides opportunities for students to independently demonstrate the use of mathematics flexibly.” The EdReports team also says that they consider opportunities to demonstrate the use of mathematics flexibly encompasses both routine and non-routine applications. If EdReports reviewers recognize that *Everyday Mathematics* offers opportunities to independently demonstrate the use of mathematics flexibly and EdReports considers using math flexibly to encompass routine and non-routine application, it is unclear how *Everyday Mathematics* could not have independent opportunities for non-routine application.

LACK OF SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

EdReports provides no details to support their finding on indicator 2c that the examples of non-routine application that we submitted as counter evidence do not meet their criteria. The reviewers do not provide examples of missed opportunities for non-routine application even though the evidence guide specifically asks reviewers to do that.

MISINTERPRETATION OF THE INTENT OF THE STANDARDS

The evidence guide for 2giii specifies that only formal names of mathematical terms, such as commutative property, can be used, even in the early grades. The Common Core State Standards, which are the basis of the EdReports rubrics, explicitly do not require use of formal terms for the properties of arithmetic at the grades in question. For example, standards 1.OA.3 and 3.OA.5 directly address the properties of arithmetic, including the commutative property of addition. Both of these standards include the following footnote: “Students need not use formal terms for these properties” (NGA, 2010, pp. 15 and 23). We believe that this guidance in the Common Core State Standards document itself is a strong justification for our terminology, but the EdReports evidence guide does not reflect the intent of the standards because it requires that when students use a mathematical term, they only use the formal term, even in the younger grades.

FLEXIBILITY FOR SUPPORTING EDUCATIONAL EQUITY

The evidence guide for 2giii specifies that only formal names of mathematical terms, such as commutative property, can be used, even in the early grades. Before students are required to be fluent with standard algorithms for addition and subtraction, the standards require that students “Fluently add and subtract within 100 using strategies based on place value, properties of operations, and/or the relationship between addition and subtraction” (2.NBT.5). If students are to become fluent with such non-standard strategies, they will need to talk about them, which means that we need names for such approaches. So, for example, in Grade 2 we use *expand-and-trade subtraction* to name one such method. This approach also gives teachers options for adjusting cognitive demand in their classroom based on the needs of all their students and supports deeper conceptual understanding of the concepts and positive attitudes toward mathematics, but the EdReports rubric does not allow for this level of flexibility.

SCORING UNDULY INFLUENCED BY OPINION

In response to the counter evidence submitted for 2giii, reviewers found that the vocabulary in the program “detracts from the learning of the language of mathematics.” *Everyday Mathematics* includes the names of program routines as vocabulary. The authors believe this is important in order for students to become comfortable with the routines. These terms are precise and grade appropriate, which are the primary considerations for this indicator. Whether or not these terms detract from learning is a matter of opinion and should not impact the review.

INCONSISTENCIES IN SCORING ACROSS REVIEWS

For indicator 2giii, reviewers identified instances where the materials use mathematical language that they find to be not precise or appropriate for the grade level and because of this they score *Everyday Mathematics* 1 out of 2 points, but in reviews of other programs where this same issue is identified, the full 2 points are awarded.

Comparison of EdReports Reviews of Indicator 2giii:

Review of Another Program Grade 3 Awarded 2/2 Points	Review of Everyday Mathematics Grade 3 Awarded 1/2 Points
The instructional materials reviewed for Grade 3 meets the expectations for the materials explicitly attending to the specialized language of mathematics. Overall, the materials provide some instruction in how to communicate mathematical reasoning using words, diagrams and symbols, however more explicit instruction related to precise communication is needed. There are instances in the materials that introduce vocabulary that is not grade appropriate and in basic, incomplete ways.	The instructional materials reviewed for Everyday Mathematics 4 Grade 3 partially meet expectations for explicitly attending to the specialized language of mathematics. The materials provide explicit instruction on how to communicate mathematical thinking using words, diagrams, and symbols, but there are instances when the materials use mathematical language that is not precise or appropriate for the grade level.