RESOURCE ALIGNMENT TOOL (MATH TOOL 1)

1. **Rate the resource against the criteria in the Mathematics Resource Alignment Tool.**[1] Use the dimensions and the evidence statements in the tool to guide your ratings. Record strengths and weaknesses for each key criterion (Focus, Coherence, and Rigor).

2. **Determine the high-value actions needed to fill gaps for the dimensions that make up each criterion.** Identify the high-value action(s) related to each criterion that will strengthen the alignment of the resource to your college and career readiness (CCR) standards. High-value actions are those that will bring your resource into much closer alignment to the standards. In many cases, while the actions take some effort, they can be efficiently executed.

3. **Give an overall score for the resource.** Summarize the overall strengths and weaknesses of the resource with respect to the three criteria to score the resource.

4. **Begin the lesson revision process.** Review the ratings and the high-value actions you identified and choose one lesson in the resource to begin the revision process. Use the Focus on the Major Work of the Level and the Mathematics Lesson Revision Template to catalogue your improvements to the lesson. To assist with the revisions, use your CCR standards and other support documents, such as the CCR Content Progressions and Standards for Mathematical Practice.

INDIVIDUAL DIMENSION RATING DESCRIPTORS	
MEETS	There is evidence in the resource to indicate that the dimension is met.
PARTIALLY MEETS	There is evidence in the resource to indicate that the dimension can be met with some revision.
DOES NOT MEET (INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE)	There is little or no evidence in the resource to indicate that the dimension is being met. Substantial revision is needed for alignment.

[1] Adapted from *Publishers' Criteria for the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics.* Washington, DC. Accessed January 13, 2015. http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_K-8_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf and http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Publishers_Criteria_HS_Spring_2013_FINAL1.pdf; *Toolkit for Evaluating Alignment of Instructional and Assessment Materials to the Common Core State Standards.*

Criterion 1 Focus: Does the resource focus strongly where the standards focus, including relevant Standards for Mathematical Practice?

DIMENSION 1.1	MEETS ☐	PARTIALLY MEETS ☐	DOES NOT MEET (INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE) ☐
Major Work of the Level (MWOTL): *Most* lessons in the resource are focused on the most critical concepts for that level. *(Support document: College and Career Readiness Content Progressions)*	Guiding Questions: • Does the resource target the standards addressing the MWOTL (as noted in the table of contents)? • Is extensive work provided with on-level problems tied to the MWOTL? • Do assignments and tasks reinforce critical concepts (MWOTL) in the lessons? • Do assignments and tasks that address supporting standards enhance the MWOTL?		

DIMENSION 1.2	MEETS ☐	PARTIALLY MEETS ☐	DOES NOT MEET (INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE) ☐
Standards for Mathematical Practice: *Each* lesson meaningfully connects mathematical content with the Standards for Mathematical Practice. *(Support document: Standards for Mathematical Practice)*	Guiding Questions: • Is at least one practice targeted in the lesson? • Is there evidence in the activities and tasks that suggests one or more practices? • For the practices included in lessons, are they central to the goals of the lessons? • Does each lesson meaningfully connect mathematical content with the targeted practices? • Do the activities and tasks of the lessons offer opportunities for students to experience the practices?		

Summary of strengths and weaknesses:

High-value actions needed to fill the gaps (check all actions that apply):

- ❑ Identify the MWOTL in the resource.
- ❑ Identify the MWOTL not covered in the resource that will need to be supplemented by other resources.
- ❑ Identify and add Standards for Mathematical Practice that are central to a lesson (or reduce the number that are addressed) and include a description of how they are related.
- ❑ Other:

Criterion 2 Coherence: Does the resource design learning around coherent progressions between levels and within the level?

DIMENSION 2.1	MEETS ☐	PARTIALLY MEETS ☐	DOES NOT MEET (INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE) ☐
Coherence Across Levels: The resource *regularly* relates on-level concepts to knowledge from previous levels and to future learning. *(Support document: College and Career Readiness Content Progressions)*	Guiding Questions: • Are there examples of lessons that ask students to connect knowledge and skills across levels? • Is mathematics content from previous levels clearly identified as "review"? • Are connections made about how the content of this lesson supports, and is connected to, future learning? Is more sophisticated math forecasted in the resource?		

DIMENSION 2.2	MEETS ☐	PARTIALLY MEETS ☐	DOES NOT MEET (INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE) ☐
Coherence Within a Level: Where appropriate, the resource connects two or more standards within a progression, or two or more progressions within a level. *(Support document: College and Career Readiness Content Progressions)*	Guiding Questions: • Does content build on understandings from previous lessons (noted in the table of contents or in a series of lessons)? • Are lessons linked to one another? • Do lessons ask students to connect knowledge and skills within lessons when it is important and natural to do so?		

Summary of strengths and weaknesses:

High-value actions needed to fill the gaps (check all actions that apply):

- ❑ Add to lessons any knowledge and skills from prior levels needed for students to understand the content.
- ❑ Identify as "review" the student tasks, activities, or assessment items included in the lessons that reference learning at previous levels.
- ❑ Recommend that student activities or assessment items addressing learning at subsequent levels be excluded from a lesson or identified as an extension of work at the current level.
- ❑ Suggest rearranging lessons so the sequence of knowledge and skills learned in the resource has a natural and logical flow to support student learning.
- ❑ Other:

Criterion 3 Rigor: Does the resource pursue conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, and application with equal intensity?

DIMENSION 3.1	MEETS	PARTIALLY MEETS	DOES NOT MEET (INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE)
	☐	☐	☐
Conceptual Understanding: The resource *regularly* develops students' conceptual understanding through tasks, problems, questions, and opportunities for students to write and speak about their understanding.	Guiding Questions: • Are students provided support to develop a conceptual understanding of the most critical concepts for the level? • Are there discussion questions that pertain to conceptual understanding in the lessons? • Are there opportunities for students to demonstrate, in multiple ways, their understanding of the critical concepts addressed in the lessons?		

DIMENSION 3.2	MEETS	PARTIALLY MEETS	DOES NOT MEET (INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE)
	☐	☐	☐
Procedural Skill and Fluency: The resource *regularly* asks students to use mathematical procedures and perform calculations and quickly and accurately.	Guiding Questions: • Are students expected to attain the fluencies and procedural skills required by CCR standards? • Are assignments/problems structured to build students' competencies to perform core calculations and mathematical procedures quickly and accurately? Is precision with calculations emphasized?		

DIMENSION 3.3	MEETS	PARTIALLY MEETS	DOES NOT MEET (INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE)
	☐	☐	☐
Application: The resource *regularly* requires students to engage in challenging applications of mathematics in real-world and mathematical contexts.	Guiding Questions: • Is the resource designed so that students spend sufficient time working with engaging applications (without losing focus on the MWOTL)? • Are students regularly provided opportunities to independently apply mathematical concepts in real-world situations and solve challenging problems?		

Summary of strengths and weaknesses:

High-value actions needed to fill the gaps (check all actions that apply):

- ❏ Add problems or tasks that are good matches to the standards targeted in a lesson and that focus on the following areas:
  - ❏ Conceptual understanding of the MWOTL
  - ❏ Challenging application problems
  - ❏ Procedural and computational practice
- ❏ Add high-level discussion questions and instructions targeted toward building conceptual understanding.
- ❏ Other:

4 Overall Rating:

TIGHT ALIGNMENT	Most (four or more) of the dimensions are rated as **Meets**, with the remainder rated as Partially Meets. There are only a few minor revisions (or none at all) needed to improve alignment of the resource with the CCR standards.	
PARTIAL ALIGNMENT	Most (four or more) of the dimensions are rated at least as **Partially Meets**. Moderate revisions are needed to improve alignment of the resource with the CCR standards.	
WEAK ALIGNMENT	Most (three or more) of the dimensions are rated as **Does Not Meet**. Substantial revisions are needed to improve alignment of the resource with the CCR standards.	
Summary of key strengths and weaknesses:		

Notes: