



*Pearson High School Mathematics*  
*Common Core*  
**Response to EdReports Evaluation**

*Pearson High School Mathematics Common Core* © 2015 is based on years of research on how students learn and what high school teachers need to help all students succeed in mathematics. The authors of *Pearson High School Mathematics Common Core* © 2015, who are thought leaders in mathematics education, carefully built and purposefully designed the content to meet the Traditional Pathway as defined by Appendix A of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSS-M). At the same time, the authors incorporated the latest research on effective teaching and learning both for and through problem solving into a 5-step lesson structure designed to help students develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and applications in equal intensity, as called for by the CCSS-M. This 5-step lesson structure has been proven by independent research to lead to statistically significant academic gains for all students.

Our analysis of the EdReports evaluations of *Pearson High School Mathematics Common Core* ©2015 shows that the EdReports evaluations continue to be plagued by inaccuracies, misunderstandings of program instructional models, misinterpretations of the both the intent and the expectation of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics and the Publisher’s Criteria, and a lack of understanding of effective curriculum development and pedagogy. Pearson Education and its authors consider the EdReports evaluation an incomplete, invalid, and unreliable reporting of the quality of the program and of its alignment to the expectations of the CCSS-M.

Both Pearson Education and its authors agree with the position of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) and National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics (NCSM) on EdReports:

The EdReports methodology, including its evaluation tool and process, has produced reviews that fall short of providing useful and accurate information about many critical features of materials reviewed, such as how the materials address the Standards for Mathematical Practice and the quality of the instructional activities. As a result, the current ratings and reviews do not provide the types and quality of information needed to make informed choices about the extent to which particular materials support students' learning, or teachers' teaching, of CCSSM.