



# **SCHOOL BOARD ACTION REPORT**

**DATE:** January 5, 2018  
**FROM:** Dr. Larry Nyland, Superintendent  
**LEAD STAFF:** Anna Box, Mathematics Program Manager  
Kyle Kinoshita, Chief of Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction

**For Introduction:** February 13, 2018  
**For Action:** March 7, 2018

## **1. TITLE**

Middle School Math Instructional Material Adoption

## **2. PURPOSE**

This Board action will approve the Middle School Math Instructional Material adoption committee's recommendation for instructional materials for all middle school math (grades 6-8) Seattle Public Schools (SPS) classrooms.

## **3. RECOMMENDED MOTION**

I move that the Seattle School Board approve the middle school mathematics instructional materials adoption committee's recommendation to adopt *enVisionmath2.0* as the instructional materials for all math classrooms in grades 6-8. This ~~would be an eight year license will provide materials~~ for 12,000 students per year ~~with options for continued use beyond eight years for nine years~~.

I further move that the Seattle School Board authorize the Superintendent to purchase *enVisionmath2.0* with consumable student textbooks as the core instructional material for all Seattle Public Schools middle school math classrooms in the amount of \$1,837,010.81.

## **4. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

In keeping with School Board Policy No. 2015, Selection and Adoption of Instructional Materials, to provide all Seattle Public School students and teachers the best possible middle school math textual materials, and to narrow the opportunity gap for historically underserved students, the School Board instructed the math content area of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction to launch a middle school math instructional materials adoption. Proposals for 11 different instructional materials were received. These proposals were evaluated by an Adoption Committee, taking into account community and teacher feedback, bias considerations, and instructional merit. Two proposals were rejected for budget reasons and three did not pass the SPS Anti-Bias Screener. From the six remaining finalists, *enVisionmath2.0* and *Glencoe Math* were selected for a nine-week field test. After the field test, the Adoption Committee reconvened to evaluate feedback and data from field test students and teachers. On December 5, 2017, the committee made a unanimous decision to recommend adoption of *enVisionmath2.0*. (See Attachment B and Attachments D – L for detailed descriptions of the committee's evaluations.)

### *Last Adoption*

Seattle Public Schools last adopted a middle school math instructional material in 2006, *Connected Mathematics Project 2.0 (CMP2)*. Teacher, student, and family responses to this material varied broadly around the district. Some parents and students reported enjoying the narrative nature of the text and the opportunity to explore some concepts very deeply. Others lamented the lack of examples, precise definitions, and formulas in CMP2. Some schools began significant supplementation of the textual materials after only a few years of implementation. At least three schools that moved away from strict adherence to the text showed tremendous gains in state math test scores, especially for historically underserved students.

### *New State College and Career Readiness Standards*

In 2013, the Washington State Legislature adopted the current mathematics college and career readiness standards. Teachers received twelve hours of professional development on the expectations of the new standards, but did not have an aligned instructional material to use with their middle school math students. Some schools created and used site-based materials. Thus, the experiences and results of this approach varied across the district.

Additionally, the new standards required some shifts of content in math courses and an emphasis on fluency as well as meaning making. Without resources aligned to these standards, students across the district do not have equal access to instructional or learning opportunities.

### *Budget Uncertainty*

In 2016, the School Board dedicated \$2,000,000 to a middle school math instructional materials adoption. The math content area of the Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction department issued a request for information and determined that there were several vendors with possibly acceptable products in the required price range. The Seattle Public Schools budget office directed the math content area to reject proposals significantly above the \$2 million limit.

## **Alternatives**

### *1. Select the hardback version of enVision.*

SPS requested information from vendors comparing options for consumable student books versus hardback (non-consumable) student books. While the *enVisionmath2.0* (“*enVision*”) text is designed as a consumable, the publisher indicated that the books could be bound in a hardback cover for student use across multiple years. This hardback version would be a direct duplicate of the consumable version, including areas on pages in which the text directs students to write in the book.

The adoption committee was unanimous in its recommendation to purchase the consumable textbook. Teachers, principals, parents, and students all voiced support of the consumable. Evidence cited for the preference of the consumable included families, students, and teachers noting the consumable is an aid to students with lower handwriting and organizational skills, and provides added flexibility for use and implementation for all students. Additionally, there was a consensus among the adoption committee members that, although the total price for hardback

books would be nearly identical to the cost of the eight-year license, the real cost would likely be higher as teachers would need to make more photocopies of student assignments and also replace the inevitable lost and damaged books. Members of the adoption committee further commented that these expenses are not always covered by all school budgets. This could ultimately lead to an inequity in access to core math materials at schools with smaller budgets.

2. *Decide not to move forward with the middle school math adoption.*

This is not recommended because it will continue the exhausting and inequitable situation that teachers and students have found themselves in over the last three years. Despite a thorough effort to attempt to align the current adopted text (*CMP2*) to standards, and identification of multiple online and print supplements to support teachers in using *CMP2*, the vast majority of student materials in use in Seattle Public Schools have been created on a school-by-school and teacher-by-teacher basis. Because of the widespread use of site-based materials, students learning in different parts of the city are likely to have very different learning opportunities. Deciding not to move forward with the middle school math adoption will continue this inequity.

### **Research**

The adoption committee reviewed multiple forms of data in a two-stage process to make their final decision. As per School Board Policy No. 2015, Selection and Adoption of Instructional Materials, the adoption coordinators solicited community feedback in both stages of the adoption process. Additional data came from the curriculum review tool the adoption committee developed, narrative feedback from the students and teachers involved in the pilot use of *enVision* and *Glencoe*, student growth data, classroom observations, accessibility considerations, and screening for bias.

A record of these reviews and deliberations is included in the attachments.

### **5. FISCAL IMPACT/REVENUE SOURCE**

Fiscal impact to this action will be a projected total of \$2 million over ~~eight or more~~ nine years of use for the purchase of *enVision* materials and for sustained and thorough teacher professional development. ~~Pearson Education, Inc., the publisher of *enVision*, has offered to provide a ninth year of instructional materials and licenses at no additional cost.~~ If more than 12,000 students require instructional materials in a single year, and there is no surplus available at schools, Pearson will offer books at a pro-rated cost, based on the number of years remaining in their contract with Seattle Public Schools. If a new middle school math adoption does not take place ~~within~~ at the end of nine years, *enVision* instructional materials could be purchased at a projected unit price of \$21 per student.

Table 1 shows a breakdown of the costs of the instructional materials.

**Table 1: Cost of Eight-Year\* License**

<b>Title/Description</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Grade 6 student materials and electronic access	\$429,880.00
Grade 6 teacher materials, electronic access, and professional development	\$0.00
Grade 7 student materials and electronic access	\$429,880.00
Grade 7 teacher materials, electronic access, and professional development	\$0.00
Grade 8 student materials and electronic access	\$429,880.00
Grade 8 teacher materials, electronic access, and professional development	\$0.00
<b>Sub-total for materials</b>	<b>\$1,289,640.00</b>
<u>Freight charge (1.65%)</u>	<u>\$21,279.06</u>
<u>Tax (10.1%)</u>	<u>\$130,253.64</u>
<u>Tax on materials and freight (10.1%)</u>	<u>\$130,253.64</u>
<u>Freight charge (1.65%)</u>	<u>\$21,279.06</u>
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$1,441,172.70</b>

~~\*Materials are available for a ninth year at no additional cost.~~

Table 2 shows the total cost of the middle school math adoption. The publisher will provide a complimentary ‘initial use’ professional development day for all teachers of middle school math in each year of the adoption. There is an internal expense for teachers’ participation in this professional development. While the bulk of this expense will be part of the Division of Teaching and Learning budget, a portion of the expense (~~\$395,838.11~~ \$393,688.92) will come from the adoption budget. In addition to the expense of instructional materials and teacher professional development, the total budget includes costs associated with the selection process and staffing coordination of adoption activities and roll-out (\$162,989.19). This is the two-year internal cost of this adoption. Funding of these expenses was approved from the original \$2 million adoption budget when the adoption process was launched.

**Table 2: Total Adoption Cost**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
Instructional materials	<del>\$1,441,172.70</del> <u>\$1,443,321.89</u>
Year 1 professional development	<del>\$395,838.11</del> <u>\$393,688.92</u>
<b>Sub-Total</b> (amount requested to be approved by School Board)	<b>\$1,837,010.81</b>
Adoption process and coordination	\$162,989.19
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$2,000,000.00</b>

Expenditure:  One-time  Annual  Multi-Year  N/A

Revenue:      One-time    Annual    Multi-Year    N/A

## 6.     COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

With guidance from the District’s Community Engagement tool, this action was determined to merit the following tier of community engagement:

Not applicable

Tier 1: Inform

Tier 2: Consult/Involve

Tier 3: Collaborate

The following forms of communication were utilized to reach the broadest audience when announcing opportunities to join the adoption committee, to complete hands-on reviews of different textbooks, or to provide community and staff input and feedback:

- District Webpage announcement
- School messenger
- School Leader Communicator (formerly Principal Communicator)
- Adoption Committee webpage
- SPS Office of Community Partnership
- K-12 Schoology Groups
- Social Media (Facebook, Twitter)
- Flyers mailed/posted in all SPS schools

To support access to review the resources, materials were available online throughout the length of the adoption.

For those who preferred hard copies for viewing, materials were publicly available in the John Stanford Center for Educational Excellence, as well as in the following school libraries from October 3, 2017 through November 3, 2017:

- Aki Kurose Middle School
- Eckstein Middle School
- Madison Middle School
- South Shore K-8 School
- Whitman Middle School

Included in this study was a field test (also referred to as a ‘pilot program’ or ‘pilot’) of the top two finalist programs. This pilot engaged 32 teachers and over 2,300 students learning middle school mathematics. (See Attachment M: Pilot Schools and Teachers) The pilot period not only provided data essential in comparing the two instructional materials under consideration, but also created institutional knowledge to guide future professional development of the instructional materials chosen for adoption. The examination of materials for final recommendation also included outreach to district staff and families through an online textbook review as well as a hard copy review available at the above listed schools in the five regions of the city. The finalist

review was open for approximately one month and communicated through all appropriate communication channels available.

The adoption committee represents all five regions of the school district and includes teachers, staff, school leaders, parents, and members of community-based organizations. The 7 men and 19 women on the committee speak a total of seven different languages and represent five different ethnicities:

- Asian (3)
- Black or African-American (4)
- Hispanic/Latino (1)
- Native American (2)
- White (20)

## **7. EQUITY ANALYSIS**

The adoption committee applied the district’s Equity Analysis tool in a manner that addressed a frequent concern relative to equity and access in a large urban school district: racial, ethnic and gender disparities in the examples, narratives, and story problems. In order to mitigate the harm inflicted on students who do not or cannot see themselves in the instructional materials, the adoption committee members applied anti-bias and sensitivity criteria to all instructional materials submitted for review. Committee members scrutinized the texts for examples of materials containing bias and/or stereotyping based on gender, race, religion and/or sexual orientation. Committee members reviewed texts and recorded all findings, drawing from evidence from the instructional materials.

Each set of instructional materials receiving markedly negative reviews in the anti-bias and sensitivity category were reviewed a second time in order to calibrate the findings. The committee eliminated three products due to multiple examples of stereotyping and/or multiple examples of offensive or inaccurate portrayals of marginalized peoples. The six remaining programs considered for content review ranked highest in their sensitivity to diverse representation and anti-bias, thereby ensuring that Seattle School students were certain to have the best selection from the pool of offerings. (see Attachment L: Anti-Bias Screener)

## **8. STUDENT BENEFIT**

Based on all the evidence gathered during the pilot period, the adoption committee firmly believes that adopting the *enVision* instructional materials will provide a substantial benefit to students, as measured not only by student academic growth, but also by student engagement, differentiation, access to online resources, and consistent learning experiences throughout the school district.

All teachers participating in the pilot program were asked to administer a pre-test at the start of the school year and to administer the same test after nine weeks of school as a post-test to compare student growth. The pre- and post-test data consistently showed higher academic growth for students piloting *enVision* than those piloting *Glencoe*, regardless of school or academic background (see Attachment I: Pilot Student Data)

In addition to the district-generated pre- and post-tests, the committee compared 8<sup>th</sup> grade data from a Smarter Balance Interim Assessment. This data again showed *enVision* students achieving higher scores than students working with *Glencoe*. Most notably, students piloting *enVision* had higher average scores than the overall Seattle Public Schools scores, with fewer *enVision* students scoring ‘below standard’ and more scoring ‘above standard’.

In addition to assessment data, the adoption coordinators conducted panel discussions with students piloting either *enVision* or *Glencoe*. Representative comments from students piloting *enVision* included: “The book explains things.” “It’s straightforward.” “When I’m confused I go back to the examples.” “I understood the lessons.”

**9. WHY BOARD ACTION IS NECESSARY**

- Amount of contract initial value or contract amendment exceeds \$250,000 (Policy No. 6220)
- Amount of grant exceeds \$250,000 in a single fiscal year (Policy No. 6114)
- Adopting, amending, or repealing a Board policy
- Formally accepting the completion of a public works project and closing out the contract
- Legal requirement for the School Board to take action on this matter
- Board Policy No. 2015, Selection and Adoption of Instructional Materials, provides the Board shall approve this item
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**10. POLICY IMPLICATION**

The introduction is in compliance with Policy No. 2015, Selection and Adoption of Instructional Materials.

**11. BOARD COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

This motion was discussed at the Curriculum and Instruction Committee meeting on February 6, 2018. The Committee reviewed the motion and moved the item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full Board.

**12. TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

Upon approval of this motion, adoption of the *enVision* curriculum for use in 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math classes will move forward, with student use beginning in the 2018-2019 school year. The implementation will follow this general timeline:

- Spring 2018 – SPS Purchasing Department will finalize contract between Seattle Public Schools and Pearson Education, Inc.

- Spring 2018 – Department of Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction will develop a schedule and desired outcomes for initial and ongoing professional development.
- Spring 2018 – Department of Technology Services will work with Pearson Education, Inc. to develop a roadmap for online components to become Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.
- June 2018 and August 2018 – Three days of ‘initial use’ professional development for teachers (teachers choose June or August option).
- Summer 2018 – Delivery of textbooks to all schools with 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math classes.
- 2018-2019 – Three additional days of professional development spread out through the school year.
- 2019-20276 – Ongoing use of *enVision* curriculum for 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math instruction. Supplemental ongoing professional development.
- 20276 – If a new middle school math adoption is not completed, the School Board may opt to continue to purchase *enVision* instructional materials.

### 13. **ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment A: *enVision* Proposal Note: The second and third pages of Attachment A show revised vendor pricing for nine years of use.
- Attachment B: Adoption Process and Timeline
- Attachment C: Adoption Committee Members
- Attachment D: Criteria for Evaluation
- Attachment E: Analysis of Feedback and Data
- Attachment F: Consent Decree Compliance
- Attachment G: Family and Community Feedback
- Attachment H: Pilot Teacher Feedback
- Attachment I: Pilot Student Data
- Attachment J: Pilot Classroom Observations
- Attachment K: Adoption Committee Scoring
- Attachment L: Anti-Bias Screener
- Attachment M: Pilot Schools and Teachers



## Attachment A: *enVision* Proposal

### **Proposal Overview and Revisions**

In response to Seattle Public Schools' Request for Proposal (RFP), Pearson, Inc., the publisher of *enVisionmath2.0* (*enVision*), submitted the proposal on the following pages. The proposal included costs for student consumable books over the course of seven years, teacher guides for 450 teachers, and access to online supplemental content and tools.

Pearson submitted several proposals in response to the RFP, including a proposal for binding student books in a hardback format. Because the adoption committee is recommending only adoption of the consumable version of the student books, only those elements of the proposal are included with this Board Action Report.

Following the recommendation to purchase *enVision*, Seattle Public Schools' Purchasing Office requested a third round of pricing options from Pearson, Inc. In addition, JoLynn Berge, Assistant Superintendent for Business and Finance, requested pricing options with fixed, up-front costs, rather than a subscription model (annual cost commitment). In response to these requests Pearson submitted revised purchasing options. ~~Those options are shown on the first page of this attachment. The second option is preferred by Ms. Berge and is the one reflected in the Board Action Report. The nine-year license pricing is shown in the second page of this attachment.~~



## Seattle Public Schools – RFP 10622- Middle School Math Agreement: 9 year total purchasing commitments

Pearson and Seattle Public Schools 9 year Middle School Math Agreement **Total Value is \$1,289,640.00 (not incl. tax/freight)**

**Multi-year pricing and payment also includes:**

- Gratis TE’s in year 1 of implementation. TE’s will remain gratis with a 20:1 student/teacher ratio purchase of SE’s.
- Program Activation Training each year for life of adoption (or 9 years).
- A "Buy One, Get One Free" purchase option for the Additional Practice Workbook for Years 2 through 9.

RFP10622 MS MATH PEARSON ENVISION								
REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION 31 JAN 2018								
RFP10622 MS MATH PEARSON ENVISION CLAIRIFICATION REQUEST 31 JAN 2018 CM pm								
BASED ON 12,000 STUDENTS PER YEAR								
BASED ON 1:20 Teacher student ratio								
YEAR	Student Books/Resources	Teacher Materials	On-Line Resources (included with student pricing)	Annual PD (program activation)	Student book unit price if beyond 12,000 copies per year	Tax if additional	Frft if additional	Grand total w/tax & frt
1	\$1,289,640.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$97.97	\$132,402.83	\$21,279.06	\$1,443,321.89
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Pro-rated down from locked in price of \$97.97 cost per student			
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Pro-rated down from locked in price of \$97.97 cost per student			
4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Pro-rated down from locked in price of \$97.97 cost per student			
5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Pro-rated down from locked in price of \$97.97 cost per student			
6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Pro-rated down from locked in price of \$97.97 cost per student			
7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Pro-rated down from locked in price of \$97.97 cost per student			
8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Pro-rated down from locked in price of \$97.97 cost per student			
9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Pro-rated down from locked in price of \$97.97 cost per student			
10+	Regular 2027 Pricing Per Student or Agree on another multi-year special pricing for SPS	\$0.00	\$0.00	Regular 2027 Pricing Per Student or Agree on another multi-year special pricing for SPS	Regular 2027 Pricing Per Student or Agree on another multi-year special pricing for SPS			

**Purchasing notes:**

- Student books/resources/teacher materials/online resources/annual program activation for 12,000 students/associated teachers for years 2-9 included within the \$1,289,640.00 advance payment cost.
- If additional student books/resources (beyond 12,000 annually) are purchased in years 2-9, those additional student books purchase at a 20:1 ratio will qualify for gratis teacher package/sets
- If additional student books/resources (beyond 12,000 annually) are purchased in years 2-9, Pearson and Seattle PS agree to lock in at a price cost of 97.97\* each, including the cost for online resources and teacher sets per ratio for life of adoption.
- \*\$97.97 is the agreed upon maximum locked in price for years 2-9 (for student books beyond 12,000) and that will be prorated/downwards years 2-9 to stay in adoption year alignment and to not overcharge the district during years of increased enrollment.
- In year 10 and above, student workbooks will be full price year by year. If in the 10 year, district wants to engage in another multi-year purchase, we will agree to create special discounted pricing for Seattle PS, a la 2018 agreement.
- On-line resources continue on at no additional charge for all original 12,000 student books and all subsequently acquired student/teacher books for 9 years

- Teacher materials commensurate to the first year 1:20 teacher student ratio for 12,000 students are supplied one time within the \$1,289,640.00 advance payment cost
- Teacher materials/package/sets beyond first year delivery will be supplied at \$546,47 per package set (if purchased alone and not tied to 20 book student book order) for the life of adoption or 9 years.
- Year 1 includes within the \$1,289,640.00 advance payment cost, 12,000 grade appropriate copies of the “optional but Pearson recommended” student workbook.
- Years 2-9 this optional workbook can be purchased at extra cost beyond/in addition to the \$1,289,640.00 (excluding tax and freight) of \$12.97 per “two” workbooks (described by Pearson as a buy 1 get 1 free program)



# Attachment A

## Pearson Proposal for enVisionmath2.0

Seattle Public Schools is committed to making its online information accessible and usable to all people, regardless of ability or technology. Meeting web accessibility guidelines and standards is an ongoing process that we are consistently working to improve.

While Seattle Public Schools endeavors to only post documents optimized for accessibility, due to the nature and complexity of some documents, an accessible version of the document may not be available. In these limited circumstances, the District will provide equally effective alternate access.

For questions and more information about this document, please contact the following:

Anna Box  
Manager, Math Content Area – Department of Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction  
[ambox@seattleschools.org](mailto:ambox@seattleschools.org)

The Pearson Proposal, dated March 22, 2017, describes the enVisionmath2.0 instructional materials, teacher guides, and online resources for middle school math. The proposal includes pricing options for consumable textbooks for a seven-year period and includes Pearson's completion of a Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT). The pricing options in this proposal have been superseded by new pricing, which precedes this portion of Attachment A.



Pearson

**Pearson Education, Inc.**

330 Hudson St.  
New York, NY 10013  
www.pearson.com

March 22, 2017

Susan Johnston  
Purchasing Services  
Seattle Public Schools  
Central Warehouse  
MS 23-376  
2445 Third Ave. S.  
Seattle, WA 98134-1923

**RE: Request for Proposal 10622**

Dear Ms. Johnston:

In response to Step 1: Middle School Math Grades 6–8 Curriculum from Seattle Public Schools (SPS), Pearson Education, Inc. (Pearson) has provided additional information on our proposed solutions in the documents that follow.

**enVisionmath2.0** Common Core Grades 6–8 ©2017 connects prior knowledge to new concepts and procedures to help students understand key points from each lesson. Students are engaged to collaborate while they explore and visualize math. Teachers can customize content, add their own content, auto-assign differentiation, and use assessment data to adjust student instruction.

*Connected Mathematics Project 3* Grades 6–8 ©2018 provides easy-to-use, detailed lesson plans that help teachers actively engage students in learning mathematics. Students focus on problem-solving strategies, habits of mind, and mathematical proficiency. They learn to communicate their reasoning by constructing viable arguments, offering proofs, and using representations.

We appreciate the opportunity to take part in the Step 1 process, and we look forward to discussing our solution with you. For more information, contact Russell Crew, Account General Manager, at 206.499.1073 or russell.crew@pearson.com. Additional materials, including correlations and information on unpacking samples boxes, can be viewed at [pearsonschool.com/wa](http://pearsonschool.com/wa).

Yours sincerely,

**Mark Welsh**

Vice President, Proposal Services and Adoption Contracts

T: 319.358.4476

F: 319.358.4284

E: [mark.welsh@pearson.com](mailto:mark.welsh@pearson.com)

Department email: [proposals@pearson.com](mailto:proposals@pearson.com)



## Seattle enVisionmath2.0 Grades 6-8 Purchase Option #2 - Consumable

### School Information:

**SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 1**

School/District Name

**2445 3rd Ave S**

Address

**Seattle, WA 98134**

City / State / ZIP

Phone Number

Purchase Summary		
Description	Amount Free	Amount Charged
	\$519,874.50	\$215,640.00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$519,874.50</b>	<b>\$215,640.00</b>
<b>Freight &amp; Tax</b>		<b>\$39,030.84</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$254,670.84</b>

**Please note that the above purchase summary is for Year 1 only. 7-Year comprehensive purchase will total to \$1,782,695.88 (inclusive of full freight and taxes).**

\* Prices effective through Sept. 30, 2018.

\*\* Titles are subject to change without notice.

To Order:  
Customer Service  
[https://pearsoncommunity.force.com/coco/s/Customer\\_Service\\_Support\\_Form](https://pearsoncommunity.force.com/coco/s/Customer_Service_Support_Form)  
Phone: 1-800-848-9500  
Fax: 1-877-260-2530  
Online at OASIS: <http://k12oasis.pearson.com>

**ALWAYS LEARNING**

ubyrnan\_S00000091 03/20/2017

	Description	ISBN	Price	Quantity		Total	
				Free	Charge	Free	Charge
1	ENVISION MATH 2.0 WASHINGTON SEATTLE STUDENT EDITION 1-YEAR SUBSCRIPTION+ DIGITAL COURSEWARE 1-YEAR LICENSE GRADE 6 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328973491	17.97	0	4,000	\$0.00	\$71,880.00
2	ENVISION MATH 2.0 COMMON CORE TEACHER EDITION PACKAGE GRADE 6 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328880966	530.47	150	0	79,570.50	0.00
3	ENVISION MATH 2.0 TEACHER RESOURCE MASTERS PACKAGE GRADE 6 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328881116	149.97	150	0	22,495.50	0.00
4	ENVISION MATH 2.0 EXAMVIEW CD-ROM GRADE 6 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328896431	128.97	150	0	19,345.50	0.00
5	ENVISION MATH 2.0 COMMON CORE ADDITIONAL PRACTICE GRADE 6 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328885022	12.97	4,000	0	51,880.00	0.00
6	ENVISION MATH 2.0 WASHINGTON SEATTLE STUDENT EDITION 1-YEAR SUBSCRIPTION+ DIGITAL COURSEWARE 1-YEAR LICENSE GRADE 7 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328973507	17.97	0	4,000	0.00	71,880.00
7	ENVISION MATH 2.0 COMMON CORE TEACHER EDITION PACKAGE GRADE 7 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328880973	530.47	150	0	79,570.50	0.00
8	ENVISION MATH 2.0 TEACHER RESOURCE MASTERS PACKAGE GRADE 7 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328881123	149.97	150	0	22,495.50	0.00
9	ENVISION MATH 2.0 EXAMVIEW CD-ROM GRADE 7 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328896448	128.97	150	0	19,345.50	0.00
10	ENVISION MATH 2.0 COMMON CORE ADDITIONAL PRACTICE GRADE 7 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328885039	12.97	4,000	0	51,880.00	0.00
11	ENVISION MATH 2.0 WASHINGTON SEATTLE STUDENT EDITION 1-YEAR SUBSCRIPTION+ DIGITAL COURSEWARE 1-YEAR LICENSE GRADE 8 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328973514	17.97	0	4,000	0.00	71,880.00
12	ENVISION MATH 2.0 COMMON CORE TEACHER EDITION PACKAGE GRADE 8 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328880980	530.47	150	0	79,570.50	0.00
13	ENVISION MATH 2.0 TEACHER RESOURCE MASTERS PACKAGE GRADE 8 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328881130	149.97	150	0	22,495.50	0.00
14	ENVISION MATH 2.0 EXAMVIEW CD-ROM GRADE 8 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328896455	128.97	150	0	19,345.50	0.00
15	ENVISION MATH 2.0 COMMON CORE ADDITIONAL PRACTICE GRADE 8 COPYRIGHT 2017	9780328885046	12.97	4,000	0	51,880.00	0.00
<b>Subtotal</b>						\$519,874.50	\$215,640.00
						<b>Purchase Subtotal</b>	\$215,640.00
						<b>Freight &amp; Tax</b>	\$39,030.84
						<b>Totals</b>	\$254,670.84

Please note--the Additional Practice Workbook is included in Year 1 pricing only. If this Additional Workbook is desired in subsequent years, it can be purchased for \$12.97 per student or downloaded free of charge.

**Proposal Year 1 Total: \$254,670.84**

Districts/schools registering to use OASIS for the first time receive a promo code for 3% freight. This code is good for every K12 order shipped via ground purchased through OASIS for the first 30 days after an account is activated.

To register for OASIS: <http://k12oasis.pearson.com>  
For OASIS assistance: 1-800-850-9124

\* Prices effective through Sept. 30, 2018.

\*\* Titles are subject to change without notice.

**Note: This is a cost proposal. It is not a formal contract.**

**Ordering Information:**

**Schools:** Simply enclose your official purchase order, authorized signature, and title.

**Teachers:** We can bill your school if you provide an approved P.O.

**Individuals:** Please enclose check, money order, or credit card information.

**Shipping Charges:**

**All orders** are billed approximately 10% shipping & handling. Orders under \$100 may be billed more.

International and overseas shipping and handling are slightly higher.

**Special handling** is additional on all orders.

All prices are in U.S. dollars, guaranteed until Sept. 30, 2017. Please call for current prices.

Districts/schools registering to use OASIS for the first time receive a promo code for 3% freight. This code is good for every K12 order shipped via ground purchased through OASIS for the first 30 days after an account is activated.

As of December 31, 2016, Pearson will no longer accept Credit Card information via postal/mail, facsimile, or email. Credit Card information will only be accepted via phone, ecommerce, or OASIS.

**Pearson Customer Support**

P.O. Box 6820

Chandler, AZ 85246

[https://pearsoncommunity.force.com/coco/s/Customer\\_Service\\_Support\\_Form](https://pearsoncommunity.force.com/coco/s/Customer_Service_Support_Form)

Phone: 1-800-848-9500 or Fax 1-877-260-2530 (Monday-Friday, 8am - 5pm EST; 8am - 6pm DST)

Order OASIS: <http://k12oasis.pearson.com>

For additional information regarding product go to: <http://www.pearsonschool.com>

# ALWAYS LEARNING



## Vendor/Publisher Questionnaire

### 1. Life/Duration of Adoption

#### *Requirement*

---

a) The District plans to support the adopted curriculum for approximately (7) seven years in the future. Will prices for tangible, on-line, e-book or any other quoted/delivered materials/services be held for seven years through the life of the adoption? Yes/No?

#### *Pearson Response*

---

Prices for **enVisionmath2.0** Common Core Grades 6–8 ©2017 (**enVisionmath2.0**) will be held for seven years through the life of the adoption for Seattle Public Schools (SPS).

#### *Requirement*

---

b) If no, please advise price escalation estimate/strategy.

#### *Pearson Response*

---

N/A

#### *Requirement*

---

c) In order to not fall behind any future mandated requirements/products/technology advances please confirm that you will support (by maintaining prices/terms) future product and service deliveries under the same prices/conditions as the originally offered adoption items. Will you provide future/advanced versions of products/services within the initial price offer? Yes/No?

#### *Pearson Response*

---

We will honor stated prices for future service and product needs. For additional mandated requirements, we will work with SPS to provide support.

### ***Requirement***

---

d) In addition to first year adoption materials/services cost, please advise any ongoing/future years costs associated with your offering. (see attachment 4)

### ***Pearson Response***

---

For complete information, see Attachment 4—Request for Estimated Pricing Form.

Pearson is offering SPS two purchase options for **enVisionmath2.0**. One option may be chosen to best fit district needs:

1. Hardcover Student Edition (plus digital)—offered as an all-in-one Year 1 purchase

With this option, SPS will have no ongoing costs. The district will have purchased all access to the print and digital resources needed for seven years.

2. Consumable Student Edition (plus digital)—offered as an annual purchase

This option will include an annual cost for purchase of the print/digital Student Edition.

### ***Requirement***

---

e) Are there "consumables" that should be replaced over the course of the adoption? (see attachment 4)

### ***Pearson Response***

---

Per Attachment 4, Pearson is offering SPS two purchase options for **enVisionmath2.0**:

1. Hardcover Student Edition (plus digital)—offered as an all-in-one Year 1 purchase

With this option, SPS will have no ongoing costs. No consumables are mandatory, so they would not need to be replaced.

2. Consumable Student Edition (plus digital)—offered as an annual purchase

This option will include an annual cost for purchase of consumables.

### ***Requirement***

---

f) Are there technology access fees that will apply to future years? (see attachment 4)

The District wants to get a sense of the life cycle cost of this adoption and desires to know the potential/future costs to support your offer. Attachment 4 requires vendors/publishers to establish incremental and total costs for the estimated seven (7) year adoption cycle.

### *Pearson Response*

---

Technology access fees are not ongoing. Access for seven years is included with the print purchase.

## 2. Technology

### *Requirement*

---

a) With technology constantly changing, please provide a brief description of current applications and those planned for implementation over the next several years.

### *Pearson Response*

---

### **Print, Blended, and Digital Learning**

**enVisionmath2.0** supports print, blended, and personalized digital learning experiences through our Pearson Realize™ platform. Teachers have the flexibility and data they need to customize material, monitor student progress, and help students demonstrate proficiency in the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics.

Lessons are available in a print Student Edition and online through Pearson Realize. For both print and digital, **enVisionmath2.0** provides an authentic learning experience for a variety of classroom models.

### **Multi-Media Resources**

The multi-media resources available online through Pearson Realize are designed to engage students in every aspect of daily lessons, promote conceptual understanding, assess understanding, and support communication of mathematical ideas.

Students can use the following digital resources through Pearson Realize:

- **eText Student Edition** contains the entire print Student Edition online and can be downloaded for offline use on a tablet through the Pearson eText for School app.
- **Math games** are online thinking exercises designed to motivate students and enhance learning. Intelligently interactive, each game challenges students to apply previous math learning and build on more complex concepts.
- **Math tools and digital math tools** activities provide ways for students to use math tools in relation to the lesson.
- **Animated math glossary** is an online program glossary for students that includes sound and animation.

- **Math practices animation and videos** explain and demonstrate each practice in student-friendly language.
- **Topic STEM projects** (provided up to four times per year) include lessons that present situations addressing real social, economic, and environmental issues. A video accompanies the lesson to engage students in the issue.
- **Example 1 & Try It! Visual Learning Animation Plus** steps out one example in the Visual Learning Bridge with engaging interactivities. Audio support is provided for struggling readers or English language learners. Students interact with this step-by-step representation of the lesson concept, which helps make the mathematics explicit. The animation pauses throughout to encourage student thinking and responses. Easy-to-find links to digital math tools and the animated glossary are also included. A link to a specific math tool is provided when helpful. Students can bounce directly to the video from the Visual Learning Bridge page in every lesson using the free BouncePages app.
- **Example & Try It!** includes Example 1, which is always the Visual Learning Animation Plus. Some use interactivity or animation to illustrate math ideas. Some ask students to fill in steps so they are active participants in developing their understanding of mathematical ideas.
- **Additional Example #1** is provided in the Teacher Edition and is only available to students online. This additional example will sometimes have interactivity (such as drag-and-drop or hot spot) or will sometimes be a static presentation (problem statement on first page; problem statement and solution on second page).
- **Additional Example #2** (included with every lesson) is an additional example in Realize course that does not appear in print. These are parameterized additional examples. Some values in the problem are algorithmic and will change each time the teacher or student chooses to view another one.
- **Key Concept PDF** presents a summary of the main math concepts presented in the lesson.
- **Do You Understand? Do You Know How? PDF** always includes having the students answer the Essential Question and focuses on determining students' understanding of lesson concepts.
- **Virtual Nerd™ Videos** are engaging tutorial videos for use as support for lesson practice and homework. Each step of concept and links to pre-requisite skills are tracked. Students can bounce directly to the video from additional practice pages of every lesson using the free BouncePages app.

- **Additional Practice PDF** helps students who need more practice. The two pages of exercises follow the structure of the practice and problem-solving exercises in the Student Edition. Also available as online practice powered by Math XL for School.

The following are digital resources that students can access when assigned by the teacher or auto-assigned online through Pearson Realize:

- **Assessments**
  - Beginning-of-year assessment
  - Cumulative/Benchmark assessment
  - End-of-year assessment
  - Next generation assessment performance tasks 1 and 2
  - Next generation assessment practice test
  - Topic readiness assessment
  - Mid-topic assessment
  - Topic performance task
  - Topic assessment
  - Lesson quiz
- **Intervention lessons** are part of the adaptive study plan and include introduction, examples, and practice.
- **Math diagnosis and intervention diagnostic tests (PDF)** is used to determine student strengths and weaknesses.
- **Math diagnosis and intervention lessons (PDF)** include guided instruction followed by practice.
- **Math practices and problem-solving handbook** reviews the mathematical processes for students and provides contexts for each. It also provides an overview of bar diagrams in operations, proportional reasoning, and quantitative reasoning.
- **Math practices posters** are used in classrooms for quick reference.
- **Topic review (PDF)** activates prior knowledge and provide practice for the prerequisite skills needed for success in the topic.
- **Topic literacy activity (PDF)** includes vocabulary, close reading, and study and organizational support.
- **3-Act Mathematical Modeling videos** show a real-world situation for which students look to apply not just math content, but math practices to solve the problem presented.

- **Topic fluency practice** (PDF) provides additional practice at the end of each topic.
- **Topic review** (PDF) provides review topic Essential Questions, vocabulary, and writing in math.
- **Topic home-school connection** provides the family with an overview of the topic and activities for reinforcement of concepts at home.
- **Today's Challenge** provides five problems with increasing difficulty using the same data to reinforce the kind of thinking students need for success on next generation assessments.
- **Solve & Discuss It! Explore It! and Explain It!** opens each lesson with an activity that incorporates the DrawPad tool.
  - Solve & Discuss It! is designed to engage students with a problem in which new math ideas are embedded. Students solve the problem in any way they choose and are given time to struggle.
  - Explore It! focuses on modeling mathematical concepts—taking data and representing it visually or simply using math to represent problems.
  - Explain It! focuses on communication, formal math vocabulary, and mathematical reasoning as an opportunity to talk about math, use mathematical vocabulary, use reasoning, and construct arguments
- **MathXL for School practice and problem-solving** provides personalized practice for every lesson to parallel the practice and problem-solving part of the lesson. Exercises are auto-scored with built-in learning aids, including Help Me Solve This, View an Example, video, animation, glossary, and math tools.
- **Reteach to build understanding** (PDF) is guided re-teaching to help students better understand lesson concepts.
- **Additional vocabulary support** (PDF) offers scaffolded support to build vocabulary.
- **Enrichment** (PDF) offers activity for advanced learners.
- **Build mathematical literacy** (PDF) provides reading and study skills support.
- **Digital math tool activity** reinforces lesson content or previously taught content.
- **Math XL for School additional practice** is personalized practice for every lesson to parallel the additional practice component. Exercises are auto-scored with built-in learning aids, including View an Example, video, animation, glossary, and math tools.

- **Adaptive practice** delivers just-right math content to each student because practice assignments are created to fit individual learning needs. This will include on-level work and instruction and practice of prerequisite skills where the student demonstrated that extra help would be beneficial. Each morning, teachers will see how students have progressed in mastering the previous day’s lesson and the related prerequisite skills. (Available in fall 2017.)

### Resources for Teachers

Pearson Realize gives teachers flexibility in planning, teaching, discussing, and monitoring progress. Teachers also save valuable time because Realize makes it easy to navigate, assign resources, search, customize, plan, assess, and analyze data.

All online resources for students listed previously are also accessible to teachers through Pearson Realize. The following resources are available only for teachers:

- **Teacher Edition eText** contains the entire print Teacher’s Edition online and can be downloaded for offline use on a tablet through the Pearson eText for School app.
- **Teacher Edition Program Overview** provides overview information, research, teaching support, a complete table of contents, scope and sequence, and more.
- **Math Diagnosis and Intervention System 2.0 (MDIS) Teacher Guide** provides an overview of MDIS, how it can be used, a correlation to grades 6–8 and individual and class record forms. Math Diagnosis and Intervention System 2.0 Diagnostic Test Answer Keys is also included.
- **Assessment sourcebook** includes an overview of assessment in grades 6–8 and masters of the following assessments: beginning of year, topic readiness, lesson quizzes, topic assessments, topic performance assessments, cumulative/benchmark assessments, end of year, practice performance tasks, and next generation assessment practice test.
- **English language learners toolkit** includes professional development articles and graphic organizers for use in the classroom.
- **Teaching Tools** (PDF) includes masters of student self-assessment tool, graphic organizers, vocabulary support, and number lines.
- **Today’s Challenge Teacher’s Guide** provides teaching support for each day’s problem. A simple before, during, and after method of providing teaching actions will help guide large and small group discussion. The teaching notes include opportunities to differentiate instruction by providing students with extra support or extension.

- **Topic overview professional development videos** feature the authors of the program sharing their expertise and information on each topic.
- **Listen and Look For videos** are short professional development videos that use examples of student work to prepare teachers for what students' understanding of the math content in the upcoming lesson will sound and look like.
- **Lesson plans** unique to each lesson are included.
- **Software resources** include Digital Resources DVD for use when the network is down (all contents available on Pearson Realize) and the ExamView assessment CD (also available online).

### ***Requirement***

---

b) Will staff and students be provided with unlimited access and capability to download and print electronic versions of all offered "hard copy" instruction materials?

### ***Pearson Response***

---

**enVisionmath2.0** on Pearson Realize offers student and teacher eText editions that can be downloaded to view offline. Students and teachers can print specific pages (as PDFs) from the Student Edition.

Teachers can also download and print PDF teacher resources on Pearson Realize, including resource masters, assessments, lesson plans, answer keys, and more.

The above resources are available through the life of the contract.

### ***Requirement***

---

c) Are there any hard or soft costs associated with unlimited access or printing rights?

### ***Pearson Response***

---

Pearson does not charge for access or printing. There are no additional charges for this functionality. However, SPS cannot print complete student editions—only selected pages—as this would be in violation of copyright law.

### ***Requirement***

---

d) Please indicate your firm's ability to supply any of the requested menus of titles in audio, E-book or similar format.



***Pearson Response***

---

enVisionmath2.0 on our Pearson Realize platform supports print, blended, and personalized digital learning experiences. The accessible Student Edition is available for and can be accessed through the Tools menu in Realize. NIMAS files have been uploaded to the NIMAC for the student editions. For more information, see [www.nimac.us](http://www.nimac.us).

***Requirement***

---

e) Please advise any costs associated with supplying audio, e-book etc.

***Pearson Response***

---

Pearson does not charge any additional costs for the above access.

***Requirement***

---

f) Please advise availability/compatibility with current common educational technology/LMS standards like IMS Common Cartridge, Sharable Courseware Object Reference Model (SCORM), and Learning Tools Interoperability (LTI). Specifically, does your product currently support integration with Schoology without more than basic configuration?

***Pearson Response***

---

We offer certified Thin Common Cartridges V1.2 and LTI V1.1. All Cartridges are compatible with Schoology.

***Requirement***

---

g) The District strongly prefers site based license. Does your firm as part of this RFP response offer site based licensing?

***Pearson Response***

---

Based on the number of student materials purchased, that number of licenses will be provisioned to the district of Seattle or to specific school sites.

***Requirement***

---

h) The District requires single sign on with ADFS (Active Directory Federated Services). Does your firm offer ADFS as part of this RFP response?

***Pearson Response***

---

Through our roster and integration service, EasyBridge Plus, the Pearson Realize platform features single sign-on and roster integration via SAML 2.0 with SPS's supported student information system.

Realize supports Active Directory Federation Services with SAML 2.0, and the platform features single sign-on and roster integration with supported student information systems to automate the flow of roster data.

Pearson will assist SPS with EasyBridge options to determine system readiness. We will also assist with the overall installation and setup process.

#### ***Requirement***

---

i) The District requires rostering capability as part of this project. The District prefers rostering functionally via Clever but can also accept verified One Roster support. Does your firm offer as part of this RFP response, Clever or verified One Roster support?

#### ***Pearson Response***

---

With EasyBridge Plus, our roster and integration service, SPS will have single sign-on functionality to EasyBridge from a Clever portal. This requires an SAML 2.0 Identity Provider such as Google or Microsoft Active Directory Federated services. EasyBridge Auto/Plus customers have the option of providing the same data they provide to Clever to Pearson for ingestion into EasyBridge.

Pearson and other leading industry publishers support the open source IMS OneRoster file standard. This open framework allows for systems such as Realize to populate roster information from any student information system using this universal file standard.

Classlink is a Portal provider that offers OneRoster integration.

### **3. Hardcover vs. Softcover Curriculum Materials**

#### ***Requirement***

---

a) Our District prefers "Hardcover" versions of teacher guides and student books including books for: interactive read aloud, guided/shared reading, core materials, and some student independent reading materials. Please advise if any textual materials you are quoting are other than hard-cover version. If you desire to offer soft-cover pricing in addition to hardcover pricing, please clearly indicate on the attached Request for Quotation form.

#### ***Pearson Response***

---

Pearson is offering SPS two different purchase options for **enVisionmath2.0**:

- A consumable Student Edition
- A hardcover Student Edition

The Teacher Edition is hardcover. All other teacher materials are softcover.

## 4. Adoption Materials Delivery Schedule

### *Requirement*

---

- a) If the District places an order with your firm by the end of April 2018, are there any offered materials (tangible, web based or otherwise) that would not arrive at the District the by end of July 2018?
- b) Please list any items that would not be available by the end of July 2018.

### *Pearson Response*

---

All materials will be available prior to July 2018.

## 5. Training

### *Requirement*

---

- a) Please provide a brief narrative of your training program.

### *Pearson Response*

---

### **Professional Development: enVisionmath2.0 Common Core Grades 6–8**

The **enVisionmath2.0** Teacher’s Edition Cluster Overview provides specific information on how the topic content supports focus, coherence, and rigor. These pages support an in-depth understanding of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for the cluster.

Each lesson overview includes lesson-specific instructional support for focus (domain, cluster, content standard, and mathematical practice), coherence, and rigor. The Listen and Look For videos provide specific information about how the targeted CCSS are implemented in the lesson and what the teacher should look for in student work and discussions.

A professional development video for each topic is provided through Pearson Realize. In this topic overview video, an author highlights and gives helpful perspectives on important mathematics concepts and skills in the topic.

Extensive teaching notes support every part of every daily lesson, all lesson and topic student resources, and assessments in the topic. Comprehensive teacher notes accompany every page of the student lesson, topic resources, and assessments. These include blue guiding questions for stimulating classroom discourse among students, incorporating math practices, preventing misconceptions, supporting coherence, providing error intervention, and analyzing student work.

### Getting Started with Program Activation and Online Support

Program Activation gives teachers the critical components they need for success in the classroom on Day 1, covering the print and digital features of **enVisionmath2.0**. We recommend this six-hour training take place for all teachers during the summer before school starts. For large implementations, we recommend centralized training locations with multiple training sessions delivered over several days.

Program Activation is included with purchase and may be onsite or online. The onsite option, delivered to cohorts of up to 30 teachers per session, is included with an order of \$50,000 or more.

Upon completion of the Program Activation training, participants will be able to perform the following tasks:

- Navigate through print and digital features
- Understand lesson structure and planning options
- Identify CCSS (or state/college and career) support
- Identify differentiated instruction opportunities
- Understand assessment and progress monitoring options

### Online Modules

Additionally, professional development tutorials and recorded webinars are available online at [myPearsonTraining.com](http://myPearsonTraining.com). Users progress through the materials at their own pace, and Program Activation topics are available as live, self-scheduled, custom webinars.

For a list of modules available by product, visit [www.myPearsonTraining.com](http://www.myPearsonTraining.com).

### Additional Professional Development

Pearson recommends additional professional development days to enhance teacher practice and deepen their understanding and use of **enVisionmath2.0**. Services other than the Program Activation training and the resources available through [myPearsonTraining.com](http://myPearsonTraining.com) are available for a fee.

These training sessions are offered across the school year. Session focus varies, is based on customer needs, and will be designed to enhance program implementation. Workshop and consultative support options include the topics described in the following figure.

Additional Professional Development	
Workshop/Service	Description
<p><b>Implementation Essentials</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1 day</li> <li>▪ Up to 30 participants</li> <li>▪ Highly recommended</li> <li>▪ Fee-based</li> </ul>	<p>Designed to support educators in implementing the program with fidelity, this training session is the next step in the professional development progression for <b>enVisionmath2.0</b>.</p> <p>Participants learn about the components, instructional design, and structure of the program. They also practice applying specific features and design elements (including instructional philosophy, lesson structure, and content) to classroom instruction through hands-on activities and observation of a demonstrated lesson.</p> <p>Participants also receive a prescriptive, week-by-week implementation training plan to use following the workshop that can be customized to their needs.</p>
<p><b>Effective Use of the Digital Path</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1 day</li> <li>▪ Up to 30 participants</li> <li>▪ Optional</li> <li>▪ Fee-based</li> </ul>	<p>This workshop focuses on teachers using technology to help students learn math with deeper conceptual understanding. Through modeling and interaction, participants learn how to successfully blend <b>enVisionmath2.0</b> lessons using the program’s print and digital components.</p> <p>Participants gain an understanding of the problem-based, interactive learning opportunities that enhance the print text and how to personalize learning to meet the needs of individual students.</p>
<p><b>Job-Embedded Assistance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1+ days</li> <li>▪ Participant group size varies</li> <li>▪ Optional</li> <li>▪ Fee-based</li> </ul>	<p>Job-embedded services for <b>enVisionmath2.0</b> provide different levels of coaching to focus on effective implementation of the program. With job-embedded support, teachers, by way of practical application, reinforce what they have learned in prior program professional development.</p> <p>These onsite services provide teachers and leaders with varying levels of support—both in and out of the classroom—to increase levels of understanding and strengthen instruction with the program. Focus areas are customized based on individual need and typically support instruction through the use of product tools and resources.</p> <p>Job-embedded services can take many forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coaching and modeling</li> <li>▪ Observation and feedback</li> <li>▪ Co-teaching</li> <li>▪ Small group lesson analysis</li> <li>▪ One-on-one mentoring of individual educators</li> <li>▪ Program consulting</li> </ul> <p>Number of days and participant size will vary depending on the type of support provided.</p>

To further support the mathematics development plans for Seattle Public Schools and in addition to the program-specific workshops and services described above, we also offer program-agnostic professional learning services that complement **enVisionmath2.0**, such as our Change of Practice Mathematics and STEM Institutes. If requested, Pearson will provide more information on these broader support solutions.

---

**Requirement**

b) Please advise if any training will not occur by the deadline/time specified on the Narrative, attachment 1, page 2.

---

**Pearson Response**

Training for **enVisionmath2.0** can meet the timeline specified by SPS.

## 6. Order Processing, Shipment Preparation, and Logistics

---

**Requirement**

a) Our District requires special packaging, labeling, palletizing and documentation on a per school basis. Can publisher/vendor provide this level of service?

---

**Pearson Response**

Pearson has significant experience and capacity delivering request for customized services. We can provide packaging, labeling, palletizing, and documentation per school, as SPS requests.

---

**Requirement**

b) Please advise if there are any additional costs for the above special per school packaging, etc. beyond prices quoted for adoption/implementation materials.

---

**Pearson Response**

Packaging has no additional charges beyond the prices provided in this proposal.

---

**Requirement**

c) Referring to Attachment 7, Bar-Code Information, please confirm that you can deliver Bar-Coded materials according to District specifications.

---

**Pearson Response**

We can deliver bar-coded materials according to SPS specifications.

## 7. Warranty/Guarantee

### ***Requirement***

---

The District requires that the vendor for this project warrant/guarantee the performance of the product/books/services for the life of the adoption (thru school years 2024-2025). Information should include a toll free phone number and website/e-mail address to contact for Warrantee/guarantee administration. This administration shall be performed directly by our end user programs/sites communicating directly with the vendor's warranty administration staff.

Product/book replacement under warranty/guarantee shall be done on an FOB Seattle Schools basis. No products/books claimed by the District under warranty/guarantee shall be returned to the vendor. District sites making claims of product failure shall provide digital images of failed products to vendor warranty administrators and shall also hold/make those failed products available (at District sites) to vendor sales rep s/ warranty administrators for physical inspection. Any District site warranty claims that are not resolved at the site level shall be brought to the attention of the District Purchasing Department. The District believes the staff/shipping/ administrative cost to return single/small quantities of products/books that are of such low initial purchase price would cost more in human and administrative resources than the products are actually worth. Replacement warrantee/guarantee products/books will be provided in the same specification/ configuration as the originally supplied product. The District will not claim for any warranty/guarantee replacement products/books that have been obviously abused/misused.

**Please advise if there is any additional cost for the District described warranty/guarantee.**

**TERMS AND CONDITIONS** of purchase shall be Seattle School District No. 1 standard Terms and Conditions can be viewed at:

[http:// www.seattleschools.org/ cms/one.aspx?portalId=627&pageId=15916](http://www.seattleschools.org/cms/one.aspx?portalId=627&pageId=15916)

### ***Pearson Response***

---

Pearson develops all materials to the highest industry specifications using quality materials. The student and teacher materials are intended to accommodate multiple users over time. Print and media materials are easy to replace for loss and population fluctuations.

See clarifications provided in the Conditions and Exceptions section of our response.

### ***Requirement***

---

8. Please advise any extra costs for providing goods/services according to District standard terms and conditions.

### ***Pearson Response***

---

See clarifications provided in the Conditions and Exceptions section of our response.

## 9. Purchase Terms/Payments

### ***Requirement***

---

a) District standard payment terms are net 30 days. Please advise if you offer a prompt payment discount FOR FASTER PAYMENTS. Yes/ No?

### ***Pearson Response***

---

We do not offer a prompt payment discount for faster payments. Our terms our Net 30.

## 10. Purchase/Sale of Adoption Materials

### ***Requirement***

---

- a) Does your sales approach work on a publisher direct to District basis or through a book depository?  
b) Please advise pros and cons.

### ***Pearson Response***

---

Pearson works with the Northwest Textbook Depository for order fulfillment, or SPS can work directly with Pearson. The shipping rate from Northwest Textbook Depository is 1.65 percent. The Northwest Textbook Depository offers quick response for lost or new materials.

### ***Requirement***

---

c) If your sales approach is through a depository, who takes contractual responsibility that deliverables (offered prices and delivery commitments) are met and on time?

### ***Pearson Response***

---

The Northwest Textbook Depository will honor any price and/or gratis material offers made by Pearson to SPS. Pearson will deliver the materials ordered by SPS to the depository at least eight business days prior to the delivery date. The depository will communicate to SPS the status of items arriving at the depository from the publisher.

### ***Requirement***

---

d) With frequent sales and mergers of publishing companies being a concern for the District, please confirm that any commercial arrangements your firm may agree to with the District for this adoption will pass on to any future management/ownership of your current company.

### ***Pearson Response***

---

Pearson can confirm.



## 11. Estimated “Per Student” Costs for Adoption

### ***Requirement***

---

a) Please advise your “per student” estimated first year cost for all combined student, teacher, technology access, consumables, freight and handling.

### ***Pearson Response***

---

Pearson is offering SPS two purchase options for **enVisionmath2.0**. One option may be chosen to best fit district needs:

1. Hardcover Student Edition (plus digital)—offered as an all-in-one Year 1 purchase

With this option, SPS will have no ongoing costs. The district will have purchased all access to the print and digital resources needed for seven years. The total per-student, first-year cost is \$106.25.

2. Consumable Student Edition (plus digital)—offered as an annual purchase

This option will include an annual cost for purchase of the print/digital Student Edition. The total per-student, first-year cost is \$21.22

### ***Requirement***

---

b) Please estimate those same costs on a per student basis for years 2 through 7 of the adoption period.

### ***Pearson Response***

---

If SPS chooses Option #1—Hardcover Student Edition (plus digital)—the district will have no additional costs in Years 2–7.

If SPS chooses Option #2—Consumable Student Edition (plus digital)—each year, in Years 2–7, will be \$21.22 (inclusive of tax and freight).

## 12. Risks

### ***Requirement***

---

a) If there are any areas of commercial/educational risk to the District that you are aware of and the District has not mentioned in our communications thus far, please share a brief explanation and identify any financial or other risks to the District.

### ***Pearson Response***

---

We anticipate no financial or other risks associated with this program.

# **508 Voluntary Product Accessibility Template™**

**for**

**enVisionmath2.0 Common Core  
Grades 6-8  
(Accessible Student Edition)**

# Purpose and Overview

## Voluntary Product Accessibility Template®

### Version 1.0

The purpose of this **508 Voluntary Product Accessibility Template**, or **VPAT™**, is to assist users and customers in making preliminary assessments regarding the features in learning platforms that support accessibility.

The first table of this VPAT provides a summary view of the Section 508 Standards. The subsequent tables provide more detailed views of each subsection. There are three columns in each table. Column one of the Summary Table describes the subsections of subparts B and C of the Standards. The second column describes the supporting features of the product or refers you to the corresponding detailed table, e.g., "equivalent facilitation." The third column contains any additional remarks and explanations regarding the product. In the subsequent tables, the first column contains the lettered paragraphs of the subsections. The second column describes the supporting features of the product with regard to that paragraph. The third column contains any additional remarks and explanations regarding the product.

**Date:** **March 21, 2017**

**Name of Product:** **Accessible Student Edition  
enVisionmath2.0 Common Core Grades 6-8**

**Notes:** **Accessible Student Editions can be found in Realize,  
under the *Tools* menu in Pearson Realize.**

**Contact for more Information:** [k12accessibility@pearson.com](mailto:k12accessibility@pearson.com)

# Summary Table

## Voluntary Product Accessibility Template®

### Summary Table

Criteria	Supporting Features	Remarks and explanations
Section 1194.21 Software Applications and Operating Systems	Not Applicable	<i>Accessible Student Edition</i> is a web-based product.
Section 1194.22 Web-based internet information and applications	Supports	Please refer to the section details.
Section 1194.23 Telecommunications Products	Not Applicable	<i>Accessible Student Edition</i> is not a telecommunications product.
Section 1194.24 Video and Multi-media Products	Not Applicable	<i>Accessible Student Edition</i> is not a video or multimedia product.
Section 1194.25 Self-Contained, Closed Products	Not Applicable	<i>Accessible Student Edition</i> is not a self-contained product.
Section 1194.26 Desktop and Portable Computers	Not Applicable	<i>Accessible Student Edition</i> is not a hardware product.
Section 1194.31 Functional Performance Criteria	Supports	Please refer to the section details.
Section 1194.41 (a) Information, Documentation and Support	Supports	Please refer to the section details.

# Web-based Internet information and applications

## Voluntary Product Accessibility Template®

### Section 1194.22 Web-based Internet information and applications - Detail

Criteria	Supporting Features	Remarks and explanations
(a) A text equivalent for every non-text element shall be provided (e.g., via "alt", "longdesc", or in element content).	<b>Supported</b>	All non-text navigation elements include an alt attribute.  All content images that directly support the lesson objective include alt attributes. Long descriptions are also included when needed.  Images included for visual reinforcement do not have alternative descriptions.
(b) Equivalent alternatives for any multimedia presentation shall be synchronized with the presentation.	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> assets.
(c) Web pages shall be designed so that all information conveyed with color is also available without color, for example from context or markup.	<b>Supported</b>	Color is not used as a sole method of relaying information.
(d) Documents shall be organized so they are readable without requiring an associated style sheet.	<b>Supported</b>	All documents are readable without an associated style sheet.
(e) Redundant text links shall be provided for each active region of a server-side image map.	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> assets.
(f) Client-side image maps	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible</i>

Criteria	Supporting Features	Remarks and explanations
shall be provided instead of server-side image maps except where the regions cannot be defined with an available geometric shape.		<i>Student Edition</i> assets.
(g) Row and column headers shall be identified for data tables.	<b>Supported</b>	Tables are constructed according HTML best practices enabling screen readers to access column and row header information.
(h) Markup shall be used to associate data cells and header cells for data tables that have two or more logical levels of row or column headers.	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> assets.
(i) Frames shall be titled with text that facilitates frame identification and navigation	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> assets.
(j) Pages shall be designed to avoid causing the screen to flicker with a frequency greater than 2 Hz and lower than 55 Hz.	<b>Supported</b>	Pages do not have content that blink, flash, or flicker.
(k) A text-only page, with equivalent information or functionality, shall be provided to make a web site comply with the provisions of this part, when compliance cannot be accomplished in any other way. The content of the text-only page shall be updated whenever the primary page changes.	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> assets.
(l) When pages utilize scripting languages to display content, or to create interface elements, the information provided by the script shall be identified with functional text that can be read by Assistive Technology.	<b>Supported</b>	Scripts in the user interface for the <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> are designed to work with assistive technology. Note that the Hide TOC feature hides the TOC visually only, to provide more viewing space for the main content, while leaving it available to assistive technologies.

Criteria	Supporting Features	Remarks and explanations
(m) When a web page requires that an applet, plug-in or other application be present on the client system to interpret page content, the page must provide a link to a plug-in or applet that complies with §1194.21(a) through (l).	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> assets.
(n) When electronic forms are designed to be completed online, the form shall allow people using Assistive Technology to access the information, field elements, and functionality required for completion and submission of the form, including all directions and cues.	<b>Supported</b>	The form fields on the <i>go to</i> page function are linked and tagged.
(o) A method shall be provided that permits users to skip repetitive navigation links.	<b>Supported</b>	Every page has "Skip Directly to Table of Contents" and "Skip Directly to Main Content" links.
(p) When a timed response is required, the user shall be alerted and given sufficient time to indicate more time is required.	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> assets.

# Functional and Performance Criteria

## Voluntary Product Accessibility Template®

### Section 1194.31 Functional Performance Criteria - Detail

Criteria	Supporting Features	Remarks and explanations
(a) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require user vision shall be provided, or support for Assistive Technology used by people who are blind or visually impaired shall be provided.	<b>Supported</b>	<i>Accessible Student Edition</i> supports with screen readers.
(b) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require visual acuity greater than 20/70 shall be provided in audio and enlarged print output working together or independently, or support for Assistive Technology used by people who are visually impaired shall be provided.	<b>Supported</b>	Persistent navigation includes a "Change text size" button that increases text size over 200%. <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> supports with screen readers.
(c) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require user hearing shall be provided, or support for Assistive Technology used by people who are deaf or hard of hearing shall be provided	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> assets.
(d) Where audio information is important for the use of a product, at least one mode of operation and information retrieval shall be provided in an enhanced auditory fashion, or support for assistive hearing devices shall be provided.	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> assets.



Criteria	Supporting Features	Remarks and explanations
(e) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require user speech shall be provided, or support for Assistive Technology used by people with disabilities shall be provided.	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Not applicable to <i>Accessible Student Edition</i> assets.
(f) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require fine motor control or simultaneous actions and that is operable with limited reach and strength shall be provided.	<b>Supported.</b>	All content can be accessed using only the keyboard.

# Information, Documentation and Support

## Voluntary Product Accessibility Template®

### Section 1194.41 Information, Documentation, and Support - Detail

Criteria	Supporting Features	Remarks and explanations
Section 1194.41 (a) Product Support Documentation provided to end-users shall be made available in alternate formats upon request, at no additional charge.	<b>Supported</b>	Available upon request.
Section 1194.41 (b) Accessibility and Compatibility Features. End-users shall have access to a description of the accessibility and compatibility features of products in alternate formats or alternate methods upon request, at no additional charge.	<b>Supported</b>	Available upon request.  For support and other inquiries please contact: <a href="mailto:k12accessibility@pearson.com">k12accessibility@pearson.com</a>
1194.41 (c) Support Services for products shall accommodate the communication needs of end-users with disabilities.	<b>Supported</b>	Available upon request.  For support and other inquiries please contact: <a href="mailto:k12accessibility@pearson.com">k12accessibility@pearson.com</a>

**This document is for informational purposes only. PEARSON MAKES NO WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, IN THIS DOCUMENT.**

© 2014 Pearson Education Inc. All rights reserved. The Pearson logos are either registered trademarks or trademarks of Pearson Education Inc. in the United States and/or other countries. The names of actual companies and products mentioned herein may be the trademarks of their respective owners. The information contained in this document represents the current view of Pearson Education on the issues discussed as of the date of publication. Because Pearson Education must respond to changing market conditions, it should not be interpreted to be a commitment on the part of Pearson Education, and Pearson Education cannot guarantee the accuracy of any information presented after the date of publication.

**Pearson Education, Inc.'s Conditions and Exceptions to  
Seattle Public Schools  
RFP #10622 Step 1  
Middle School Math Adoption Grades 6-8**

Pearson Education, Inc., (“Pearson”) as part of its response to Seattle Public Schools (the “Customer” or “District”), submits the following conditions and/or exceptions with respect to the above-referenced Request for Proposal (the “RFP”). Pearson understands that the terms of the final agreement may be subject to further negotiations between the Customer and Pearson in the event the Customer awards a contract pursuant to the RFP.

**GENERAL CONDITION:** Pearson is submitting its response to the RFP on the basis that, if Customer chooses to award Pearson a contract pursuant to the RFP (1) the form of agreement to be used for the project will be negotiated between the parties or (2) Customer will incorporate the conditions and exceptions set forth in this document and the terms of any licenses governing the products offered under this RFP into the final agreement provided that such incorporated terms will take precedence over any conflicting terms in the RFP. Sample license agreements will be made available for Customer’s review on request. If requested by the Customer, Pearson will negotiate in good faith regarding the possible inclusion of additional or modified provisions in Pearson’s applicable license agreements, whether such terms arise from the Customer’s RFP document or otherwise.

In connection with any digital products being offered under this RFP, Pearson reserves the right to change and/or update technology platforms, including possible edition updates to customers during the term of access. This will allow Pearson to continue to deliver the most up-to-date content and technology to customers. The Customer will be notified of any change prior to the beginning of the new school year.

**SPECIFIC CONDITIONS/EXCEPTIONS:** Without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, Pearson’s response to the RFP is subject to the following specific conditions and exceptions. Again, Pearson is willing to discuss these conditions and exceptions, as well as any other proposed agreement terms, with Customer.

**Attachment 2**

Page 2, Document Conflict: Pearson is proposing “off-the-shelf” products in this response, and as noted in the General Conditions above, Pearson licenses these products under standard terms and conditions. Therefore, Pearson wishes to make clear that, while it is willing to consider the inclusion of mutually acceptable clauses from the RFI in the final contract, Pearson is submitting its proposal on the basis that its standard license agreements will be used as the basis for contract negotiations. Therefore, any “order of precedence” would begin with Pearson’s standard license agreements.

**Terms and Conditions**

Page 2, Section 10: Pearson requests the following clarifying language:

“Pearson will hold the Customer harmless and indemnify the Customer against any third party claim that any product, in the form delivered by Pearson to the Customer, infringes or violates any valid United States patents or copyrights of a third party existing at the time of delivery; provided that Pearson must be given prompt, written notice of the claim and allowed, at its option, to control the defense and settlement of any such claim. In addition, if the Customer’s use of any product is restricted as the result of a claim of infringement, Pearson shall, at its option, either: (a) substitute other equally suitable product; (b) modify the allegedly infringing product to avoid the infringement; or (c) procure for the Customer the right to continue to use such product free of the restrictions caused by the infringement. This shall be the Customer’s exclusive remedy for third party claim of infringement claim against the product..”

Page 2, Section 14: Pearson shall provide the warranties set forth in the license agreements or terms of use of the applicable product offerings submitted in response to this RFI and warrants that the products offered under this RFI shall comply with any requirements set forth in the RFI. Except as otherwise set forth in this document, Pearson disclaims all other warranties.

Page 3, Section 19: Pearson reserves the right to assign any resulting contract to an affiliate or successor entity.

## **Attachment B: Adoption Process and Timeline**

### **RFP and Proposals: February – March 2017**

Following its usual procedures and protocols, the Seattle Public Schools (SPS) Purchasing office issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) in February 2017 to advertise for vendors to submit proposals for consideration for a middle school math textbook adoption. Vendors submitted proposals for 11 different instructional materials in March 2017 for review:

1. *Big Ideas*
2. *Connected Mathematics Project 3 (CMP3)*
3. *Core Focus on Math*
4. *enVision*
5. *Eureka Math*
6. *Glencoe*
7. *Glencoe with Aleks*
8. *Go Math*
9. *I-Ready*
10. *Math in Focus*
11. *Open-Up Math*

*Glencoe with Aleks* and *I-Ready* exceeded the budget limits and were not reviewed for content or cultural responsiveness in Stage 1.

### **Stage 1: March – June 2017**

The Math Content Area of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment developed an adoption timeline and communications plan for the middle school math adoption. School-based and general community feedback regarding instructional material priorities was solicited through online and paper surveys.

SPS publicized through its webpages and by direct emails the opportunity to apply to join an Adoption Committee. Applications were reviewed and final membership of the committee was determined.

To help inform the work of the adoption committee, a ‘needs assessment’ survey was sent to SPS families and teachers. While participation in the survey was not vast, for those who did participate it was clear that both the community and staff have similar goals for middle school instructional materials:

- Flexibility for teachers, students, and families
- Alignment to state standards
- Inclusion of facts and procedures along with opportunities for students to explore and make meaning of the math.

The adoption committee, comprised of teachers, staff, and community members, met on six occasions between March and June of 2017. (Detailed Adoption Committee minutes are posted on the math adoption webpage.) Major activities of the committee in Stage 1 included:

- Using SPS and community goals and commitments to develop evaluation criteria for review of materials.
- Reviewing submitted programs using the committee's screening tool.
- Reviewing and incorporating community feedback on each program.
- Eliminating from consideration all programs determined to fail the required SPS Anti-Bias Screener. (See Attachment L: Anti-Bias Screener)
- Using the selection criteria to select two programs (*enVision* and *Glencoe*) to move forward to Stage 2.

The application of the adoption committee's screening tool revealed the following strengths and weaknesses of each instructional material that passed the anti-bias screener.

### *Big Ideas*

This instructional material is well aligned to state standards, has both rich tasks and practice style problems, and contains easy to find and easy to use examples and definitions. Committee members struggled to find problems at the depth of knowledge consistent with the standards and remarked that the teacher materials do not have the flexibility needed to make lessons accessible for all students. Committee members also struggled to find word problems and scenarios that confirm cultural variation or affirm cultural differences.

### *CMP3*

This instructional material does not have the balance of conceptual and procedural problems the committee hoped to see. The instructional material also lacked precise definitions, formulas, or examples. There were few materials to support a wide range of learners, and few supports for special populations. The instructional material is generally aligned to standards, but the committee was clear that this alignment is not enough. Students must be able to engage with the materials, teachers must be able to use the material to help all students learn, and families deserve a resource that contains definitions, formulas, and examples.

### *enVision*

This instructional material is well aligned to state standards, has a variety of styles of problems, contains built in review of key concepts, includes teacher materials that prompt learning in multiple modalities, contains materials that teachers can easily and readily modify to support a wide range of learners and includes examples that are easy to find and utilize. *enVision* also has strong resources for families to use with students and confirms cultural variations and differences.

### *Glencoe*

This instructional material contains a variety of student tasks, is well aligned to state standards, provides both conceptual and procedural problems, has precise definitions and formulas, includes a variety of formats to be accessible to a wide variety of learners, is flexible and easily modifiable for teachers and even contains performance tasks at the appropriate depth of rigor.

Further, it contains built in review of key concepts, provides supports for special populations, and confirms cultural variations and differences.

### *Go Math*

While *Go Math* has a good balance of conceptual and procedural problems, is aligned to state standards, and has some precise definitions and formulas, the committee hoped to see more built-in review of key concepts, more materials prompting learning in a wide range of learners, more supports for special populations, and more family and community resources. In general, it was not determined to be a flexible instructional material.

### *Math in Focus*

This instructional material was the least aligned to state standards of the programs reviewed. It also has few application problems and provides little support for differentiation. Some of the definitions in the program were determined to be either hard to find or not helpful. Some formulas and examples were judged to be imprecise. *Math in Focus* does come with a variety of assessment options and contains some rich questions, but the committee was concerned that the lack of alignment rendered these good qualities less helpful.

Using only the committee's screening tool, the adoption committee determined the following order of preference:

1. *enVision*
2. *Glencoe*
3. *Big Ideas*
4. *Go Math*
5. *Connected Math Project 3 (CMP3)*
6. *Math in Focus*

As per policy, community feedback was incorporated into the adoption committee's deliberations. Despite advertising on social media, the SPS webpage, direct email to families and staff, paper flyers in multiple languages delivered to schools, and an open house with translators, community feedback was quite limited. Approximately 40 people submitted feedback forms. While the committee would have preferred more community feedback, the voices of these community members was valued, honored, taken seriously, and incorporated.

An analysis of the community feedback forms indicated this order of preference:

1. *Math in Focus*
2. *Glencoe*
3. *enVision*
4. *Big Ideas*
5. *Go Math*
6. *Connected Math Project 3 (CMP3)*

As *CMP 3* ranked very low in both the community and the committee reviews, it was immediately and by a unanimous vote of the adoption committee removed from consideration.

Given that *enVision* ranked high for both the adoption committee and the community, it was unanimously approved as an instructional material to be included in the “short list” of materials considered in Stage 2.

Based on the merits listed above for *Glencoe*, it was also unanimously agreed by the adoption committee to add it to the short list to be considered in Stage 2.

Due to the deficiencies of *Math in Focus* listed above, despite the community’s affinity for it, the committee voted unanimously to remove it from consideration.

The committee and community rankings of *Big Ideas* and *Go Math* were very similar: both groups viewed them as a second tier of materials for SPS students and teachers.

As the length of the short list is not defined in Policy No. 2015, Selection and Adoption of Instructional Materials, the committee debated the most helpful number of books to be on the short list. Arguments were made for the short list to include three programs since that is the typical length of the short list. Arguments were also made to include the top four programs since *Big Ideas* and *Go Math* were very similar in merits and ranking.

Neither *Big Ideas* or *Go Math* appeared to be community favorites, scoring in the bottom half of community feedback. Just as the long list of merits from community and committee members for both *enVision* and *Glencoe* indicated that these programs are “better than what the majority of teachers are now using,” the list of weakness in *Big Ideas* and *Go Math* indicated that neither of them is sufficiently superior to the programs many teachers are currently piecing together from a variety of sources. Weighing these variables, the committee unanimously voted not to include *Big Ideas* or *Go Math* on the short list of materials to be considered in Stage 2.

## **Stage 2: August-November 2017**

Stage 2 of the adoption process, usually referred to as the Pilot Stage or Pilot Program, consisted of a field test of the *enVision* and *Glencoe* instructional materials and online components. Pilot teachers were selected, representing schools in all five regions of the school district and whose students mirror the school district’s overall demographics for ethnicity, socio-economic status, and historical academic performance. Pilot teachers for each instructional material participated in a one-day training session provided by each instructional material’s publisher, were issued teacher and student textbooks, given access to teacher and student online resources, and were provided with a general guideline for the timing of lessons to be taught during the nine-week pilot period.

To gather information regarding the effectiveness and use of each instructional material, the adoption coordinators developed assessments to measure student academic growth towards mastery of standards, conducted classroom observations, surveyed pilot teachers, and held panel discussions with students. In addition, a second round of Family and Community Feedback was gathered, with materials from the two pilot curricula on display for community review in five schools throughout the district.



At the end of the pilot period, the Adoption Committee met two additional times to review all feedback and data from the pilot. Based on the feedback and data from the pilot program, as well as a final review of both textbooks, the committee reached unanimous agreement to recommend *enVision* for adoption by the School Board. The adoption process was validated by the Instructional Materials Committee, as stipulated in Board Policy No. 2015, Selection and Adoption of Instructional Materials.

### **Stage 3: Spring 2018 – Spring 2019**

Upon approval of adoption of the *enVision* instructional material, the SPS Purchasing office will work with Pearson Education, Inc. to develop a final contract. Once that contract is signed, the Purchasing office will make plans for the distribution of materials to all schools in which 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, or 8<sup>th</sup> grade math is taught. The SPS Department of Technology Services will work with Pearson to determine which online elements are not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant, and to create a roadmap for bringing those elements into compliance. The Department of Technology Services may make recommendations for alternatives to the use of some online components if those components will likely not become ADA compliant in a timely manner.

In Stage 3 of the adoption process, often referred to as ‘rollout’ or ‘implementation’, the adoption coordinators will form a committee to guide professional development activities. This committee will likely include some members of the adoption committee, which advocated for thorough professional development to better ensure effective use of the adopted instructional material. This professional development will consist of two distinct stages: 1) Summer – three days of training on the instructional material, assessments, modifications, and online components, and, 2) School Year – four days of lesson planning, online implementation, and enrichment activities.

### **Ongoing Use: 2018 – 2027~~6~~**

The adopted instructional material will continue to be used by teachers and students for a ~~an~~ eight~~nine~~-year period. After the first year, some ongoing professional development will continue to be provided by SPS. This will provide training for new teachers and will also support all teachers in ongoing instructional improvements.

### Attachment C: Adoption Committee Members

#### **Adoption Coordinators**

<b>Name</b>	<b>School or Community</b>
Anna Box – Coordinator	Math Program Manager
Marleen Boone - Co-coordinator (Winter-Spring 2017)	Math Curriculum Specialist
Audrey Roach - Co-coordinator (Winter-Spring 2017)	Math Assessment Specialist
Patrick Gray - Co-coordinator (Fall 2017-Spring 2018)	Math Curriculum Specialist

#### **Staff**

<b>Name</b>	<b>School or Community</b>
Seth Bundy – teacher	Hamilton Middle School
Sara Burke – teacher	Jane Addams Middle School
Julie Gatti – teacher	Franklin High School
Hillary Graham – teacher	Whitman Middle School
Lisa Kadobayashi – teacher	View Ridge Elementary School
Anita Koyier-Mwamba – Coordinator, School Family Partnership	John Stanford Center for Educational Excellence
Wendy Miller – math coach	Washington Middle School
Jon Moor – math coach	Denny Middle School
Erin Rasmussen – assistant principal; principal	Aki Kurose Middle School; Emerson Elementary School
Jasmine Riach – teacher	Madison Middle School
Lynn Rody – teacher	Eckstein Middle School
Travis Sims – teacher	Broadview-Thomson K-8
Jenna Velozo - teacher	Jane Addams Middle School

#### **Community Members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>School or Community</b>
Charity Allen	Salmon Bay K-8
Colleen Bettis	Denny Middle School
Felix Darvas*	Hamilton Middle School
Kim Fergus	View Ridge Elementary School
Helen Gerety	Seattle University: Center for Community Engagement
Philip Kong	Wedgwood Elementary School
Phyllis Lewis	Mercer Middle School; Franklin High School; Rainier Beach High School
Valeri Makam	Cascadia Elementary School
Frederick Ngobi	Sacajawea Elementary School
Andrew Reder	University Tutors for Seattle Schools
Jacqueline Shin	Daniel Bagley Elementary School

Committee members represent all regions of the school district. More than 20% of committee members are non-white.

\*Resigned from committee at May 2017 meeting.

## **Attachment D: Criteria for Evaluation**

### **Overview**

The adoption committee, taking into consideration all relevant School Board policies, academic requirements, needs of students and teachers, and best practices for instruction, developed a comprehensive review tool. This document identified seven major categories and 31 sub-categories for evaluating instructional materials. For each category, the adoption committee developed a weighted scoring system to ensure the evaluation of materials was in line with the priorities identified by the committee based on their expertise and community feedback.

### **Categories and Subcategories**

- A. Mathematical Content – 23 possible points
  - 1. There is evidence of appropriate alignment to state standards.
  - 2. There is a combination of conceptual, procedural, and application problems.
  - 3. The text provides rich tasks that support differentiation.
  - 4. There is a variety of student tasks – such as projects, small group tasks, and individual tasks.
  - 5. Content is spiraled throughout the course.
  - 6. There are resources (such as strategies or techniques) for teaching the Standards for Math Practices.
  - 7. A range of instructional strategies can be supported.
  - 8. There is a progression of learning across the year.
  - 9. Attention is paid to vertical alignment, especially at Grades 5 – 9.
- B. Student Needs and Accessibility – 13 possible points
  - 1. The materials are engaging for students.
  - 2. There are precise definitions, formulas, and examples.
  - 3. The format is consistent throughout the instructional materials.
  - 4. The instructional materials are easily accessible in a variety of formats (print, web-based) to enhance learning for all students (ELL, SPED, gifted and talented).
  - 5. The instructional materials prompt learning in multiple modalities (reading, listening, watching, peer collaboration, mentorship, and manipulation) for each respective domain: conceptual, procedural, and application.
  - 6. Is at an appropriate reading level without an overwhelming amount of text.
- C. Teacher Tools and Resources – 13 possible points
  - 1. Resources (i.e. assignments, lessons, and projects) can be easily modified and are differentiated for a range of students.
  - 2. There are content supports built in for teachers.
  - 3. Teacher and student materials are available digitally (editable) and in hard copy.
  - 4. Resources include suggestions for manipulatives and visual representations.
  - 5. Suggested manipulatives and/or visual representations are not items teachers must buy.

- D. Assessments – 13 possible points
  - 1. Assessment materials are available digitally and in hard copy and can be modified.
  - 2. There are intentional supports for special populations – i.e. Special Education, English Language Learners, and Highly Capable.
  - 3. There is a variety of assessment options.
  - 4. Assessments mirror Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBA).
- E. Family and Community Resources – 9 possible points
  - 1. The material includes family resources.
  - 2. Resources affirm cultural identities and differences.
  - 3. The material includes multi-lingual resources beyond Spanish. Examples include Somali, Arabic, Chinese, and Vietnamese.
  - 4. The material is available digitally and in hard copy.
- F. Cultural Responsiveness – 9 possible points
  - 1. The material confirms cultural variation.
  - 2. The material affirms cultural identity.
  - 3. The material affirms variance in family structure.
- G. Budget – 20 possible points
  - 1. The material is under or very near the \$2 million threshold; points will be allocated according to an algorithm that assigns more points to less expensive programs.

### **Application of Criteria**

The adoption committee used the criteria listed above in the Round 1 evaluation of materials and again in Round 2 after the conclusion of the pilot period. In both Round 1 and Round 2, multiple committee members completed evaluations of each curriculum and scores were then averaged.

## **Attachment E: Analysis of Feedback and Data**

### **Overview**

In both Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the adoption process, *enVision* and *Glencoe* were rigorously evaluated by all stakeholder communities. Through this evaluation, a consistent pattern emerged showing a clear preference for *enVision* from parents, teachers, and students throughout the district. This preference was bolstered by student growth data conducted during the Stage 2 pilot program, in which students learning from the *enVision* text demonstrated growth that was not only higher than the state average, but also higher than the growth demonstrated by students learning from *Glencoe*. This document serves as a summary of all feedback and evaluations completed during Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the adoption process.

### **Consent Decree Compliance**

Under the terms of the Consent Decree of 2015, Seattle Public Schools (SPS) is required to ensure that all individuals with disabilities have “equal opportunities to participate in and benefit from SPS’s services, programs, and activities.” In particular, the school district must take steps to ensure that any web-based or digital technologies are accessible to users who are blind. Both the *enVision* and *Glencoe* products contain substantial online components for teacher, parents, and students to access. Each vendor was asked to submit documentation of their compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The submission for *enVision* indicated full compliance. The submission for *Glencoe* indicated a high-level of compliance with some deficits. SPS conducted an independent test of each curriculum’s online components and found that neither was fully accessible to a blind user. The *Glencoe* online components received a failing score with a blind user unable to access even basic elements. The *enVision* online components received a low passing score, with some elements accessible. Under the terms of the consent decree, SPS may enter into contracts with vendors who are not fully compliant, so long as the vendor agrees to develop plans in coordination with SPS to reach full compliance in a timely manner. See Attachment F.

Conclusion: *The enVision vendor is more likely to be able to comply with the requirements of the Consent Decree than the Glencoe vendor.*

### **Family and Community Feedback Data**

In Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the adoption process, members of school communities and the public were invited to review the materials under consideration for adoption and to provide feedback on those materials. Feedback was gathered through paper and online surveys during two separate feedback windows, and materials were available for review in six different locations in distinct regions of the school district. In four out of five categories, *enVision* received more “Good” or “Outstanding” ratings than *Glencoe*, while in the fifth category they were tied. See Attachment G.

Conclusion: *Family and Community Feedback shows a preference for enVision.*

## **Pilot Teacher Feedback**

All pilot teachers were asked to complete a survey about their experiences teaching from *enVision* or *Glencoe* during the nine-week pilot period. The survey data showed more positive feedback for *enVision* in the following areas: Alignment with standards, Support for students working above grade level, Lesson planning, and Cultural responsiveness. Pilot teachers had more positive feedback for *Glencoe* in working with struggling students and family resources. The two instructional materials received equal praise for online materials. See Attachment H.

*Conclusion: enVision received more positive feedback from teachers piloting the two instructional materials.*

## **Pilot Student Feedback**

The adoption coordinators conducted multiple panel discussions with students participating in the pilot program. Feedback from students was relatively consistent between *enVision* and *Glencoe*, with both instructional materials receiving criticism for the content of story problems, while also receiving praise for explanations at the start of lessons. Students criticized the paper quality of the *Glencoe* book and mentioned that the examples were unhelpful when they encountered more difficult problems. Students using the *enVision* text had mixed feedback about problems that guided their work, but generally appreciated being able to write in the book. In all panel discussions students commented that the teacher was essential for their learning.

*Conclusion: Students enjoy working from a consumable book and had positive feedback regarding enVision's mathematical content and lesson layout.*

## **Pilot Student Data**

During the Stage 2 pilot program, the adoption coordinators had the opportunity to gather and analyze multiple sources of student growth data. For both instructional materials and all three grade levels, pilot teachers were asked to give their students a Pre-Test and a Post-Test covering the essential concepts their students would be learning in the first nine weeks of the school year. In addition, because *enVision* and *Glencoe* covered identical content in the first units of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade curriculum, schools piloting those grade levels were asked to administer a Smarter Balanced interim assessment.

At each grade level, for each instructional material, and for nearly every standard, students learning from the *enVision* instructional material demonstrated higher growth toward mastery of standards than those learning from the *Glencoe* instructional material. On the Smarter Balanced interim assessment, students learning from *enVision* again outperformed those learning from *Glencoe*. It's worth noting that students learning from both *enVision* and *Glencoe* performed above the Washington state average. See Attachment I.

*Conclusion: Student assessment data indicates higher growth for those learning from the enVision instructional material.*

### **Pilot Classroom Observations**

During the pilot phase, SPS staff members conducted observations in each pilot classroom. During these observational visits, the staff members recorded their observations and scored each instructional material in six major categories that mirrored the categories first developed by the Adoption Committee for use in evaluating textbooks. During these observations, staff members noted features of the textbooks used by teachers and students, and also noted levels of student engagement with the materials, particularly for students who might represent historically underserved communities. See Attachment J.

*Conclusion: enVision outperformed Glencoe in four out of six categories. The largest differences were in the use of rich tasks that support differentiation and materials enhancing learning for all students.*

### **Adoption Committee Scoring**

The adoption committee developed a list of 31 criteria in six major categories to assess the different textbooks submitted for consideration. Proposed textbooks also received a score for their budget. The committee members used the criteria in Round 1 and again in Round 2 to score each textbook. Multiple committee members reviewed each book and their scores were then averaged. In every major category, the *enVision* text outscored the *Glencoe* text by 11% to 54%. The adoption committee also weighed the merits of a consumable book versus a hard-bound book, taking into account feedback from both teachers and students. The feedback showed a clear preference for a consumable textbook. See Attachment K.

*Conclusion: The adoption committee unanimously recommends adoption of the enVision instructional material in consumable format.*

### **Anti-Bias Screener**

The adoption committee used the Anti-Bias Screener in Board Policy No. 2015, Evaluation and Adoption of Instructional Materials, to evaluate all textbooks submitted for consideration. The *enVision* text passed the anti-bias screener with consensus by the committee. The *Glencoe* text, along with three others, did not initially pass the anti-bias screener. The committee decided to review the four texts a second time, taking into account guidance from Seattle Public Schools' Race and Equity office. In the second review, the committee concluded that *Glencoe* passed the Anti-Bias Screener (the other three did not). See Attachment L.

*Conclusion: Both enVision and Glencoe comply with the requirements of Board Policy No. 2015, Evaluation and Adoption of Instructional Materials.*

## **Feedback and Preference Summary**

- ADA Compliance – *enVision*
- Family and Community Feedback – *enVision*
- Staff Feedback – *enVision*
- Student Feedback – *Neutral*
- Pilot Data – *enVision*
- Adoption Committee – *enVision*
- Anti-Bias Screener - *Neutral*



## Attachment F: Consent Decree Compliance

To ensure maximal accessibility of all products purchased by Seattle Public Schools, and to comply with a 2015 Consent Decree relating to all electronic resources purchased by Seattle Public Schools, completion of the most recent version of the Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) was required of vendors submitting materials for review by the middle school math textbook adoption committee.

In February 2017, at the request of the math content area and the purchasing office, Michael Miller, Seattle Public Schools Accessibility Officer, reviewed all VPATs submitted. Below are the results of this review:

<b>Curriculum</b>	<b>VPAT Status</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<i>Big Ideas</i>	Passed	
<i>Connected Math Project (CMP)</i>	Passed	
<i>Core Focus on Math</i>	Passed	
<i>enVision</i>	Passed	
<i>Eureka</i>	Passed with caveat	Instructional material is entirely online. SPS Civil Rights office indicates SPS would have sole responsibility for ensuring ADA compliance.
<i>Glencoe</i>	Did not pass	Two sections required further description or explanation by vendor
<i>Go Math</i>	Did not pass	Four sections required further description or explanation by vendor.
<i>Math in Focus</i>	Did not pass	Three sections required further description or explanation by vendor.
<i>Open Up Math</i>	Passed with caveat	Instructional material is entirely online. SPS Civil Rights office indicates SPS would have sole responsibility for ensuring ADA compliance.

Mr. Miller suggested that after the math adoption committee determined a short list, any vendor that was a finalist and had not yet met VPAT requirements would be contacted and asked to provide the details or explanations needed to resolve deficiencies.

In June, the adoption committee's short list of instructional materials included one program that passed the VPAT review (*enVision*) and one program that had not yet passed the VPAT review (*Glencoe*.)

To follow-up with *Glencoe*, in the summer of 2017, the purchasing office requested responses to Mr. Miller's questions. Ruth Kreiger at McGraw Hill (*Glencoe*'s publisher) replied that, "All content necessary to meet the learning objectives of the *Glencoe Math* program is available in

print format. The online materials delivered via ConnectED provide additional practice and support, but are not required components for teachers or students. For those students who do access Glencoe assets in ConnectED, no image maps, electronic forms, or data tables are used.” She went on to say, “The *Glencoe* program offers animations, virtual manipulatives, eTools and an eGlossary via ConnectED. These assets are only available through the web-based platform. As stated above, these assets are not necessary to meet the learning objectives of the program, and the objectives are met by the already available print components of the program.”

In August, Michael Miller retired and Shaun Serena was hired to replace him. At the request of the adoption coordinators, Mr. Serena conducted an analysis of the degree of accessibility of both the *enVision* and *Glencoe* online features for compliance with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0. WCAG 2.0 covers a wide range of recommendations for making Web content more accessible and meeting WCAG 2.0 standards is a requirement of the Consent Decree. The guidelines in WCAG 2.0 are intended to make online content accessible to a wider range of people with disabilities, including blindness and low vision, deafness and hearing loss, learning disabilities, cognitive limitations, limited movement, speech disabilities, photosensitivity and combinations of these. Mr. Serena’s findings are detailed below:

#### ***Glencoe* – Grade: F**

The VPAT submitted by the vendor identified several areas in which they would need to make revisions to achieve ADA compliance. Our Accessibility Coordinator at that time considered this sufficient to allow *Glencoe* to move forward to the pilot phase of the adoption. During the instructional material pilot, SPS had a vision-impaired (fully blind) user try accessing online *Glencoe* resources using manual assistive technology. The user found that the program does not meet the basic requirements of accessibility. SPS would need to work with the product team at McGraw-Hill to develop an accessibility roadmap to achieve WCAG 2.0 AA compliance. If the vendor is unable to provide a plan to reach this level of accessibility the product may need to be rejected or the selection could require Superintendent approval.

- The estimated level of effort to achieve WCAG 2.0 AA would be *high* based on the findings from the manual assistive technology review.

#### ***enVision* – Grade: C**

The VPAT submitted by the vendor identified no areas in which they would need to make revisions to achieve ADA compliance. This passed the review of our Accessibility Coordinator at that time. During the textbook pilot, SPS had a vision-impaired (fully blind) user try accessing online *enVision* resources using manual assistive technology. The user found that the program meets some basic ADA accessibility requirements with conformance, user log in, and lesson load. However, the core content of *enVision* is graphic (Flash), which is a poor choice to achieve WCAG 2.0 AA compliance. This program also fails to meet the ADA requirements for accessibility. SPS would need to work with the product team at Pearson to develop an accessibility roadmap. If the vendor is unable to provide a plan to reach this level of accessibility the product may need to be rejected or the selection could require Superintendent approval.

- The estimated level of effort to achieve WCAG 2.0 AA would be *medium* as the tool has a solid foundation for the basic requirements of accessibility. This vendor has also shown the willingness to work with SPS on accessibility efforts with other products.

The adoption coordinators met with Mr. Serena and members of the Purchasing Department to review these findings. The group agreed that under the terms of the Consent Decree, SPS could move forward with either instructional material and would need to work with the selected vendor to modify the online components to become fully accessible, or work to develop alternatives to using the online components. The information contained in the VPAT for *enVision*, combined with the findings of the district's independent review, suggest that it is more likely that ADA compliance will be achievable with *enVision* than with *Glencoe*.

## Attachment G: Family and Community Feedback

### Round 1 Family and Community Feedback

*Question 1: This book works for middle school students with a wide range of abilities.*

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<i>Big Ideas</i>	6	4	5	5
<i>Connected Math Project</i>	9	10	4	3
<i>Core Focus on Math</i>	5	9	3	3
<i>enVision</i>	3	9	6	5
<i>Eureka</i>	5	4	6	6
<i>Glencoe</i>	3	9	4	5
<i>Go Math</i>	7	7	9	1
<i>Math in Focus</i>	0	8	8	9
<i>Open Up</i>	4	8	2	4

*Question 2: This book can be adapted to my students' needs.*

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<i>Big Ideas</i>	6	6	8	4
<i>Connected Math Project</i>	9	7	6	2
<i>Core Focus on Math</i>	5	8	5	2
<i>enVision</i>	6	6	6	4
<i>Eureka</i>	6	3	5	6
<i>Glencoe</i>	3	10	5	4
<i>Go Math</i>	6	9	8	0
<i>Math in Focus</i>	0	10	7	8
<i>Open Up</i>	5	5	6	3

*Question 3: The assessments provided meet my expectations.*

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<i>Big Ideas</i>	6	5	5	4
<i>Connected Math Project</i>	8	4	4	3
<i>Core Focus on Math</i>	4	6	6	3
<i>enVision</i>	4	5	9	3
<i>Eureka</i>	6	5	4	3
<i>Glencoe</i>	4	5	3	5
<i>Go Math</i>	4	7	7	1
<i>Math in Focus</i>	0	8	8	4
<i>Open Up</i>	6	5	3	2

Question 4: The resources provided will help me support my students.

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<i>Big Ideas</i>	7	7	6	3
<i>Connected Math Project</i>	10	5	8	1
<i>Core Focus on Math</i>	4	7	7	3
<i>enVision</i>	5	5	8	6
<i>Eureka</i>	7	3	8	3
<i>Glencoe</i>	4	7	6	5
<i>Go Math</i>	3	8	11	0
<i>Math in Focus</i>	2	7	7	8
<i>Open Up</i>	6	7	3	2

Question 5: This book does not contain racist or sexist comments and tries to fairly represent a variety of cultures.

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<i>Big Ideas</i>	2	8	5	6
<i>Connected Math Project</i>	4	4	7	4
<i>Core Focus on Math</i>	3	5	9	2
<i>enVision</i>	2	6	7	5
<i>Eureka</i>	2	4	10	3
<i>Glencoe</i>	1	4	9	6
<i>Go Math</i>	2	4	11	3
<i>Math in Focus</i>	1	6	10	5
<i>Open Up</i>	3	5	7	2

Which of these categories do you feel is most important for ranking the math books?

<b>Category</b>	<b>Responses</b>
This book works for middle school students with a wide range of abilities	20
This book can be adapted to my students' needs	12
The assessments provided meet my expectations	1
The resources provided will help me support my students	3
This book does not contain racist or sexist comments and tries to fairly represent a variety of cultures	5

## Round 2 Family and Community Feedback

*Question 1: This book works for middle school students with a wide range of abilities.*

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<i>enVision</i>	3	4	15	10
<i>Glencoe Math</i>	2	11	14	4

*Question 2: This book can be adapted to my students' needs.*

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<i>enVision</i>	2	5	13	12
<i>Glencoe Math</i>	4	8	13	6

*Question 3: The assessments provided meet my expectations.*

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<i>enVision</i>	2	4	19	7
<i>Glencoe Math</i>	2	7	15	3

*Question 4: The resources provided will help me support my students.*

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<i>enVision</i>	4	3	13	11
<i>Glencoe Math</i>	2	10	9	9

*Question 5: This book does not contain racist or sexist comments and tries to fairly represent a variety of cultures.*

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<i>enVision</i>	3	3	17	9
<i>Glencoe Math</i>	1	4	21	5

*Which of these categories do you feel is most important for ranking the math books?*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Responses</b>
This book works for middle school students with a wide range of abilities	9
This book can be adapted to my students' needs	10
The assessments provided meet my expectations	3
The resources provided will help me support my students	7
This book does not contain racist or sexist comments and tries to fairly represent a variety of cultures	1

## Attachment H: Pilot Teacher Feedback

### Process

At the conclusion of the Pilot phase of the adoption process, pilot teachers were asked to complete a survey to reflect their experiences and opinions of the two instructional materials under consideration.

Ten teachers provided feedback on *Glencoe Math*

Five teachers provided feedback on *enVision*

### Survey Responses

Please note the following descriptive conventions:

- ‘Consistently high marks’ indicates more than 80% of the scores were high or the comments favorable
- ‘Overall high marks’ indicates 70% to 80% of the scores were high or the comments favorable
- ‘Mostly high marks’ indicates 51% to 69% of the scores were high or the comments favorable
- ‘Mixed marks’ indicates 50% or fewer of the scores were high or the comments favorable

#### 1. *How well or poorly would you say this material is aligned to standards?*

**enVision:** 100% of teachers responding gave the alignment a high or very high rating. One teacher mentioned the rigor level was also on target. However, there were two criticisms added in the feedback on this question: 1) the organization of the materials might have room for improvement, and, 2) the instructional material may teach the algorithms before students have a chance to make enough meaning of the concepts.

**Glencoe:** Overall high marks for standard alignment, although two teachers rated the alignment as only fair or average. Two specific instances of misalignment to standards were noted: 1) missing a thorough treatment of division with remainders in Grade 6, and, 2) includes slope (though it is not a standard) in Grade 7

#### 2. *Do you feel this textbook helped you in meeting the needs of students who were struggling to achieve grade level mastery?*

**enVision:** Mixed reviews from teachers. Teachers liked the suggestions in the teachers’ guide for differentiation, the scaffolds in the book, the re-teaching worksheets, and the videos. Components receiving lower marks included the page layout and the treatment of certain topics.

**Glencoe:** Three of 10 teachers declined to comment as they are teaching students who are not in this category of learner. Overall high marks from the teachers who used this book with struggling learners. Specifically, teachers liked: the extra practice, a high level of rigor, lots of examples, the page layout, and having some answers provided for students. One teacher commented that the order of teaching fractions after decimals did not help struggling learners.

Having to supplement for struggling students was mentioned by at least one teacher in *both* pilot groups.

3. *Do you feel this textbook helped you in meeting the needs of students who were working above grade level?*

**enVision:** Consistently high marks from the teachers who used this book with students working above grade level. Specifically, teachers mentioned that they liked the enrichment sheets and the overall variety of problems. At least two teachers commented that students enjoyed the enrichment problems.

**Glencoe:** Overall high marks from the teachers who used this book with students working above grade level. Specifically, most teachers liked the enrichment sheets and the higher order thinking (HOT) problems. At least one teacher commented that this instructional material was “rarely” helpful for students working above grade level or finishing early. Another teacher said, “[The] enrichment problems were mostly ridiculous.”

4. *Tell us feedback you received from families.*

**enVision:** Mostly high marks from the teachers who received family feedback. Teachers mentioned that families liked having vocabulary, examples, and definitions. Reviews about the family experience of online components were mixed. Two of five teachers reported that families liked the online components. Two different teachers remarked that some families did not find the online homework component useful. One of the two teachers whose families did not really love the online work also said her 5<sup>th</sup> grade students prefer paper-and-pencil homework.

**Glencoe:** Overall high marks from the teachers who received family feedback. Teachers mentioned that families like having examples and definitions. Two teachers remarked that the online component was family friendly. Several teachers reported not receiving any family feedback at all.

5. *What did you think of the online resources, both for your use and the use of your students?*

**enVision:** Mixed results. Some teachers reported that students and families found the resources and the experience helpful and friendly. Some did not. Teachers’ ability to find and use the online teacher resources also received mixed reviews. At least two teachers found the online work with students beneficial since students received instant feedback. At least one teacher said, “The online access is great and the online homework is a good option for many students.”

**Glencoe:** Mixed results. Some teachers reported that students and families found the resources and the experience helpful and friendly. Some did not. At least one teacher mentioned a lack of training in using the online resources. At least one teacher appreciated the videos and another teacher found the live projection opportunities with students useful. Some teachers liked the organization of the online materials; some did not. Some reported they did not use the online components.

6. *How well did this book help or hinder you with lesson planning, assessment, and collaborating with other teachers?*

**enVision:** Consistently high marks from teachers on the use of the book to plan lessons and collaborate with others.



**Glencoe:** Overall high marks. Teachers consistently liked having the instructional material as a starting point for lesson planning. One teacher did say she and her teaching partner had to create worksheets that blanked out what the instructional material printed. This teacher said that felt like a burden. This teacher also said the teacher guide was bulky and not easy for her to fully access.

7. *Were there any instances where you felt this material was culturally insensitive or otherwise precluded students from being able to relate to the material?*

**enVision:** No teachers reported any issues.

**Glencoe:** Almost all teachers said no. One teacher however did say, “Only one challenge: when my student who is color blind couldn’t tell there was a difference in green and yellow on a page.”

### Summary

Question	Higher Scoring Program
1. Standards Alignment	<i>enVision</i>
2. Aid for struggling students	<i>Glencoe</i>
3. Aid for students working above grade level	<i>enVision</i>
4. Response from families	<i>Glencoe</i>
5. Online resources	Tie
6. Lesson planning tool	<i>enVision</i>
7. Cultural responsiveness	<i>enVision</i>

### Analysis

- Both programs received high marks from most teachers in most categories.
- *enVision* had higher marks in more categories than *Glencoe*.
- In the few categories where *Glencoe* received higher marks than *enVision*, the district math specialists can use this information to make plans prior to instructional material rollout to support teachers in these areas. For example, one family did not have a good experience with *enVision* online components. The adoption coordinators are already working with this family to determine how the experience would have been better so that other families do not have similar negative experiences.

## Attachment I: Pilot Student Data

### Pilot Pre- and Post-Test Data by Grade & Curriculum

The percents in each table represent the average score for each problem. For example, on Question #1 on the Pre-Test, 6<sup>th</sup> grade students learning from *Glencoe* had an average score of 10%. On the Post-Test, their average score increased to 37%, representing a gain of 27%.

The *Glencoe* and *enVision* 6<sup>th</sup> grade instructional materials did not have any overlap in content in the first two units of study (the duration of the pilot period), so a direct comparison between overall achievement is not possible. Only a comparison of *growth* can be made.

**Pre-Test & Post-Test Comparison (*Glencoe* 6th)**

Standard	6.RP.1	6.RP.1	6.RP.2	6.RP.3a	6.RP.3a	6.RP.3b	6.RP.3c	6.RP.3c
Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Pre-Test</b>	10%	25%	70%	50%	31%	26%	18%	18%
<b>Post-Test</b>	37%	44%	80%	69%	47%	44%	54%	34%
<b>Gain</b>	27%	19%	10%	19%	16%	18%	36%	16%

**Pre-Test & Post-Test Comparison (*enVision* 6th)**

Standard	6.NS.1	6.NS.1	6.NS.3	6.NS.3	6.NS.3	6.NS.3	6.NS.6b	6.NS.6c
Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Pre-Test</b>	13%	21%	56%	49%	11%	4%	33%	42%
<b>Post-Test</b>	77%	51%	77%	68%	48%	38%	81%	80%
<b>Gain</b>	64%	30%	21%	19%	37%	34%	48%	38%

**Pre-Test & Post-Test Comparison (*Glencoe* 7th)**

Standard	7.RP.1	7.RP.1	7.RP.2a	7.RP.2b	7.RP.2c	7.RP.2d	7.RP.3
Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Pre-Test</b>	75%	23%	28%	29%	57%	33%	30%
<b>Post-Test</b>	72%	36%	66%	60%	72%	63%	59%
<b>Gain</b>	-3%	13%	38%	31%	15%	30%	29%

**Pre-Test & Post-Test Comparison (*enVision* 7th)**

Standard	7.RP.1	7.RP.1	7.RP.2a	7.RP.2b	7.RP.2c	7.RP.2d	7.RP.3
Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Pre-Test</b>	69%	13%	18%	18%	62%	31%	30%
<b>Post-Test</b>	65%	29%	80%	76%	80%	72%	67%
<b>Gain</b>	-4%	16%	62%	58%	18%	41%	37%

**Pre-Test & Post-Test Comparison (*Glencoe* 8th)**

Standard	8.EE.1	8.EE.2	8.EE.2	8.EE.3	8.EE.3	8.EE.4	8.EE.5	8.EE.5	8.EE.7b
Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pre-Test	16%	30%	14%	27%	39%	36%	8%	40%	11%
Post-Test	40%	42%	59%	54%	49%	31%	9%	36%	42%
Gain	24%	12%	45%	27%	10%	-5%	1%	-4%	31%

**Pre-Test & Post-Test Comparison (*enVision* 8th)**

Standard	8.EE.1	8.EE.2	8.EE.2	8.EE.3	8.EE.3	8.EE.4	8.EE.5	8.EE.5	8.EE.7b
Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pre-Test	11%	25%	13%	23%	33%	24%	1%	25%	14%
Post-Test	35%	44%	55%	77%	55%	44%	38%	55%	57%
Gain	24%	19%	42%	54%	22%	20%	37%	30%	43%

**8<sup>th</sup> Grade Smarter Balanced EE Interim Assessment**

Following the guidance of the SPS Research, Evaluation, and Assessment office (REA), the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) interims were selected as the preferred measure for comparing mastery of standards by students using *Glencoe* versus students using *enVision*. REA recommended this assessment because it is aligned to state standards, is easily accessed at the school level, is psychometrically valid, and can be administered at no additional cost.

The organization of both the *enVision* Grade 8 instructional material and the *Glencoe* Grade 8 instructional material aligned nicely for using the SBA Expressions and Equations 1 (EE1) Interim assessment. Students learning from either instructional material likely had opportunity to master the standards assessed on this interim by late November 2017.

REA did not recommend assessing students in Grades 6 and 7 who participated in the pilot since the books were organized differently and students using *Glencoe* learned significantly different content than students using *enVision* at the 6<sup>th</sup> grade level, and somewhat different content at the 7<sup>th</sup> grade level.

**Summary of Results**

Population	Number of Students	Percent of Students Below Standard	Percent of Students At or Near Standard	Percent of Students Above Standard
Washington State	3,315	39	46	15
Seattle Public Schools	567	16	54	30
<i>Glencoe</i> Middle School	278	14	64	21
<i>enVision</i> Middle School	249	12	44	44

**Notes:**

- Students taking the Grade 8 EE1 Interim are sixth, seventh, or eighth graders at both schools.
  - At the *Glencoe* school, approximately half the students are in Grade 6, working two years above grade-level.
  - At the *enVision* school, approximately one-third of the students are in Grade 6, working two years above grade-level.
- Several piloting Grade 8 classrooms at other schools did not participate in taking the interims. Approximately 40 students around the district not in the pilot did take the SBA EE1. Due to small sample size, REA recommended not including those results in this analysis

An analysis of the data may suggest:

- The students at schools using either instructional material were more likely than peers around the state to meet or exceed standards on SBA EE1.
- The schools using *Glencoe* had a higher percentage of students at or near standard than the percent of students at or near standard for the district and state
- The schools using *enVision* had a higher percentage of students above standard than the state, district, or SPS schools using the *Glencoe* school.

In general, student scores on previous SBA summative tests and student demographics are the strongest predictors of who will and who will not meet standard on the SBA EE1. Controlling for these variables, ***REA reports that there is statistically-significant evidence that students taught from enVision have a higher probability of meeting or exceeding standards on SBA EE1 than students taught from Glencoe.*** Please note, as a caveat, REA wishes, for the sake of validating results, more schools had participated in taking the SBA EE1. That is, some of the difference in scores may not be directly attributed to the differences in the two textbooks.

## **Attachment J: Pilot Classroom Observations**

### **Overview**

To compare how the *enVision* and *Glencoe* textbooks and online resources were being used by teachers and students, Seattle Public Schools staff members visited all pilot classrooms to gather observational data. These staff members included math specialists, a member of the Indian Education Services group, and the adoption coordinators. They used an observation tool based on the Criteria for Evaluation (see Attachment D) developed by the adoption committee. They initially worked in pairs to calibrate their observations and then continued most observations independently.

Observations scores were given on a two-point scale based on the following ratings: 2 = ample evidence, 1 = some evidence, 0 = No evidence, or n/a = not expected to be observed in this class. The “n/a” rating was most often used in the Assessments category, as observers did not regularly expect to see assessments during their observations.

### **Data Trends**

*enVision* outscored *Glencoe* in Student Needs and Accessibility, Teacher Tools and Resources, and Family and Community Resources. *Glencoe* outscored *enVision* in Mathematical Content and Assessments. Members of the adoption committee noted that although *Glencoe* had an overall higher score in Mathematical Content (by 3%), *enVision* had a substantially higher score (by 75%) in the Mathematical Content sub-category regarding differentiation (see table on following page). Committee members felt this was an important distinction and indicated that *enVision* appeared to be the stronger instructional material in four out of five categories.

## Data Summary

The table below shows the average scores (on a 2-point scale) each instructional material earned in each criterion from the classroom observations. Table cells are highlighted to indicate which instructional material had a higher category or criteria score.

<b>Criteria</b>	<i>enVision</i>	<i>Glencoe</i>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>A. Mathematical Content</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>0.04</b>
A.1 - Level to which we observe alignment to state standards.	1.59	2.00	0.41
A.2 - Level to which we observe conceptual, procedural, and application problems.	1.40	1.43	0.03
A.3 - Level to which we observe rich tasks that support differentiation.	1.00	0.57	0.43
A.4 - Level to which we observe the Standards for Math Practices being taught or intentionally utilized/referenced.	0.50	0.64	0.14
<b>B. Student Needs and Accessibility</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.35</b>
B.1 - Level to which we observe students engaging in the material.	1.81	1.50	0.31
B.2 - Level to which we observe materials enhancing learning for all students (ELL, SPED, gifted and talented).	1.13	0.62	0.51
B.3 - Level to which we observe the instructional materials prompting learning in multiple modalities.	0.67	0.44	0.22
<b>C. Teacher Tools and Resources</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.08</b>
C.1 - Level to which we observe use of publisher-provided differentiation materials.	0.88	0.76	0.12
C.2 - Level to which we observe the use of publisher-provided manipulatives and/or visual representations.	0.85	0.82	0.03
<b>D. Assessments</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>0.25</b>
D.1 - Level to which we observe assessments in digital and/or paper form.	1.60	1.50	0.10
D.2 - Level to which we observe assessment supports designed for special populations.	0.40	1.00	0.60
<b>E. Family and Community Resources</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.27</b>
E.1 - Level to which we observe family resources in use or referenced.	0.89	0.61	0.28
E.2 - Level to which we observe that the student experience with materials is bias-free and confirms cultural variation.	0.90	0.56	0.34
E.3 - Level to which we observe resources are available to use digitally and in hard copy outside of school.	1.00	0.80	0.20
<b>F. Cultural Responsiveness</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.19</b>
F.1 - Level to which we observe the material affirming cultural identities and differences.	0.38	0.00	0.38
F.2 - Level to which we observe the material affirming variance in family structures.	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.13</b>

## Attachment K: Adoption Committee Scoring

### Summary of Final Committee Scoring

At the December 5, 2017 adoption committee meeting, committee members completed a final review and scoring of the *enVision* and *Glencoe* instructional materials, using the criteria evaluation tool described in Attachment D. Scores from different committee members were averaged, showing the following results:

- In every category reviewed, *enVision* earned a higher percentage of points than *Glencoe*.
- *enVision* earned a near-perfect score in “Teacher Tools and Resources”
- While neither instructional material earned stellar scores in “Family and Community Resources,” or “Cultural Responsiveness,” both passed the SPS anti-bias screener (see Attachment L). Of the two programs, *enVision* received a considerably higher percentage of points than *Glencoe* in these categories.
- Both *enVision* and *Glencoe* instructional materials are within budget requirements.

#### Final Score Comparison – Committee Evaluation

Category*	<i>enVision</i> : Percent Score	<i>Glencoe</i> : Percent Score
A. Mathematical Content	85.7	77.2
B. Student Needs and Accessibility	84.1	70.2
C. Teacher Tools and Resources	98.7	74.0
D. Assessments	91.7	74.2
E. Family and Community Resources	45.8	35.4
F. Cultural Responsiveness	34.1	22.1

\*See Attachment D for a detailed description of each category.

## **Attachment L: Anti-Bias Screener**

### **Overview**

All middle school math textual materials were reviewed using the Anti-Bias Screener found in School Board Policy No. 2015, Selection and Adoption of Instructional Materials. Following the advice of Eric Caldwell, Instructional Materials Chair, the Anti-Bias Screener tool was not modified in any way. It was used in full and in its entirety as it appears in Board policy.

### **Initial Review of Materials**

The adoption committee began its work by reading and discussing the Seattle Public Schools (SPS) strategic plan. This document was chosen by the adoption coordinator to help ground the instructional material selection in the ideas and values articulated in the strategic plan of the school district. Committee members discussed the intersections of their work and the strategic plan. It was noted by several committee members that the strategic plan states: “We believe it is our responsibility to do whatever it takes to ensure that every child, regardless of race, gender, socioeconomic status, language proficiency, learning style or disability, achieves to their highest level.”

On May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 at the third adoption committee meeting, committee members studied the Anti-Bias Screener, practiced applying it, and calibrated results. After gaining experience using the tool, the committee examined all instructional materials submitted. Five instructional materials passed the Anti-Bias Screener with consensus at this meeting: *Big Ideas, Connected Math Project 3, enVision, Go Math, and Math in Focus*. For each of these, committee members noted ethnic groups tended to be portrayed in equitable proportions, some people of color, women or people with disabilities were portrayed in non-stereotypical ways, the programs each have components that engage students across varied learning styles and multiple intelligences, and the materials use a range of formative and summative assessment strategies.

### **Secondary Review of Materials**

Four programs did not pass the Anti-Bias Screener in its first application. To further investigate the appropriateness of *Core Focus on Math, Eureka, Glencoe, and Open Up* committee members voted to take a second day applying the Anti-Bias Screener. In preparation to finish the anti-bias review of these programs the committee examined SPS demographic data and math trends for white and black middle school math students in Seattle. The committee also read a short excerpt from Zaretta Hammonds’s book, *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain*. This book was recommended by the SPS Race and Equity office as a helpful resource for leading adults in anti-bias work.

After further review and calibration, the committee used its decision-making protocol to determine that the deficiencies in *Glencoe* were not overly pronounced or egregious and that it passed the Anti-Bias Screener. These materials, at least occasionally, respectfully represent differences in customs and daily living; the materials, again at least occasionally, “support the open and accurate portrayal of all people;” and a wide variety of students could very likely see “themselves and their culture reflected in an open and accurate manner.”



After a second review, committee members remarked that the *Core Focus on Math* materials do not support “open and accurate portrayals of all people,” and do not often or consistently respectfully portray differences in customs and daily living. Committee members reported a disconcertingly high proportion of photographs and illustrations of white people only. For example, in 20 randomly selected pages, there were 15 photographs of white people compared to 5 of people of color. In a different random selection of 20 pages from a different grade level *Core Focus on Math* textbook, there were 16 photographs and illustrations of white people compared to 4 photographs and illustrations of people of color. These ratios of 3 (or 4) photographs or drawing of white people to every 1 photograph or drawing of a person of color were substantiated in random samples from each text submitted by *Core Focus on Math*. In summarizing the findings from this book, a committee member remarked that when only the dominant paradigm is represented it is hard for half of our SPS students to see themselves in the work and therefore hard for engagement and learning to happen.

Similarly, even after a second review, reviewers were very concerned that the *Eureka* materials did not represent minorities nearly often enough in a variety of professional and vocational roles. Nor did they find evidence that the materials provided “accurate racial, ethnic, and cultural information.” Perhaps most strikingly, the *Eureka* materials did not receive a rating of “consistently” or even “occasionally” in the “perspectives” category of the Anti-Bias Screener. To shed light on a few of the criteria in this category, committee members said that they very, very rarely found evidence in *Eureka* of materials that would allow students from groups other than the majority culture to “see themselves and their culture reflected in an accurate and respectful manner.” Additionally, reviewers struggled to find compelling examples of the materials engaging students “across varied learning styles and multiple intelligences.”

When reviewing for the criteria in the category “culturally responsive instructional strategies and assessment,” committee members remarked during a second review that the *Open Up* materials were not “engaging for students across varied learning styles and multiple intelligences.” Additionally, committee members perceived the *Open Up* materials as not portraying ethnic groups accurately and respectfully. The committee also did not find much evidence that “differences in customs and daily living [were] portrayed respectfully” in the *Open Up* materials. Finally, the materials did not address the needs of a variety of styles of learners. For these reasons, this material did not pass the Anti-Bias Screener after a second review.

## **Conclusion**

After two rounds of review, the adoption committee determined the following instructional materials passed the Anti-Bias Screener:

- *Big Ideas*
- *Connected Mathematics Project 3*
- *enVision*
- *Glencoe*
- *Go Math*
- *Math in Focus*

**Attachment M – Pilot Schools and Teachers**

<b>Instructional Material</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Teacher</b>	<b>Number of Classes</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>
<i>enVision</i>	6	Aki Kurose Middle School	Justin Sklar	3	37
<i>enVision</i>	6	Fairmount Park Elementary	Rebecca Christl	1	26
<i>enVision</i>	6	Hamilton Int’l Middle School	Tessa Burchardt	3	86
<i>enVision</i>	6	View Ridge Elementary	Carol Carlson	1	24
<i>enVision</i>	6	View Ridge Elementary	Lisa Kadobayashi	1	24
<i>enVision</i>	7	Eckstein Middle School	Carrie Kazala	3	70
<i>enVision</i>	7	Eckstein Middle School	Mary Williams	4	118
<i>enVision</i>	7	Eckstein Middle School	Jeff Jacobs	5	143
<i>enVision</i>	7	Fairmount Park Elementary	Rebecca Christl	1	26
<i>enVision</i>	7	Jane Addams Middle School	Jenna Velozo	2	49
<i>enVision</i>	7	Jane Addams Middle School	Kaylee Heu	2	48
<i>enVision</i>	7	Jane Addams Middle School	Tyler Baublitz	1	29
<i>enVision</i>	7	Jane Addams Middle School	Zach Martin	3	80
<i>enVision</i>	8	Jane Addams Middle School	Kaylee Heu	2	63
<i>enVision</i>	8	Jane Addams Middle School	Nick Borges	2	61
<i>enVision</i>	8	Jane Addams Middle School	Sara Burke	2	63
<i>enVision</i>	8	Madison Middle School	Liz Andraesen	2	52
<i>enVision</i>	8	Madison Middle School	Shana Norton	3	78
<i>enVision</i>	8	Madison Middle School	Theresa O’Donnell	5	150
<i>Glencoe</i>	6	Broadview-Thomson K-8	Travis Sims	2	25
<i>Glencoe</i>	6	Jane Addams Middle School	Holly Westerfield	2	43
<i>Glencoe</i>	6	Jane Addams Middle School	Tyler Baublitz	3	70
<i>Glencoe</i>	6	Lawton Elementary School	Emilia Misner	3	69
<i>Glencoe</i>	6	Leschi Elementary School	Katie Snyder	1	6
<i>Glencoe</i>	6	Leschi Elementary School	Nicole Hampton	1	9
<i>Glencoe</i>	6	Washington Middle School	Maci Nelson	4	73
<i>Glencoe</i>	6	Washington Middle School	Wendy Miller (math coach)	n/a	n/a
<i>Glencoe</i>	7	Catharine Blaine K-8	Jessie Kyobe	1	26
<i>Glencoe</i>	7	Catharine Blaine K-8	Mary Torcaso	1	27
<i>Glencoe</i>	7	Hamilton Int’l Middle School	Kelly Barker	1	26
<i>Glencoe</i>	7	Hamilton Int’l Middle School	Seth Bundy	4	123
<i>Glencoe</i>	7	Hamilton Int’l Middle School	Tessa Burchardt	2	59
<i>Glencoe</i>	7	Leschi Elementary School	Nicole Hampton	1	2
<i>Glencoe</i>	8	Hamilton Int’l Middle School	Jane Thurik	5	160
<i>Glencoe</i>	8	Hamilton Int’l Middle School	Jordan Gussin	4	135
<i>Glencoe</i>	8	Hamilton Int’l Middle School	Kelly Barker	1	35
<i>Glencoe</i>	8	Washington Middle School	Jennifer Ford	5	106
<i>Glencoe</i>	8	Washington Middle School	Steven Payne	5	115

**Total Students: 2,338**

*enVision* Students: 1,227

*Glencoe* Students: 1,111