Supporting Implementation of Math Recovery® Professional Development
A Michigan Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Grant

Cohorts 1 & 2 Teacher Interview Report

Prepared by Science and Mathematics Program Improvement (SAMPI)
Western Michigan University

Crystal Stein, B.A.
Kristin Everett, Ph.D.
Robert Ruhf, Ph.D.
Mary Anne Sydlik, Ph.D.

May 2016

Supporting the Implementation of Math Recovery® Professional Development is funded by the Michigan Mathematics and Science Partnership competitive grants program of the Michigan Department of Education. The purpose of the project is to implement a 40-hour training called Add+VantageMR® (AVMR®) designed for K-5 teachers. The training consists of two AVMR® courses designed to provide a detailed understanding of how children develop understanding of early numeracy (Course 1) and number domains of place value and multiplication and division (Course 2). K-5 teachers also are trained to administer AVMR® assessment tools that help them recognize students' current mathematics understanding and build on their current ways of reasoning. The training of the first cohort of teachers began in spring/summer 2015. Trainings were implemented by the Muskegon Area ISD Regional Mathematics and Science Center (Muskegon) and the following partners:

- Calhoun Intermediate School District (Calhoun)
- Eastern Upper Peninsula Mathematics and Science Center (EUP)
- Mason-Lake Oceana Mathematics and Science Center (Mason)

SAMPI at Western Michigan University conducted telephone interviews in February and March 2016 with a sample of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 teachers as part of an on-going evaluation of Math Recovery®. The goal was to gather data on the major strengths and limitations of the program as well as potential impacts on participating teachers and their students. *Evaluator comments and a summary of teacher responses are provided on the next pages. Teacher responses are presented in an appendix at the end of this report.*

The external evaluation is being conducted by Science and Mathematics Program Improvement (SAMPI), Western Michigan University (WMU). Contact Dr. Kristin Everett (email: kristin.everett@wmich.edu or phone: 269-387-2417) or Dr. Mary Anne Sydlik (email: maryanne.sydlik@wmich.edu or phone: 269-387-5393) for more information about the evaluation.

Interview Methodology. SAMPI contacted 40 teachers from 2015-2016's Cohort 1 and Cohort 2. Two teachers from Cohort 1 and one teacher from Cohort 2 did not respond. Eighteen (18) Cohort 1 and nineteen (19) Cohort 2 teacher participants at four sites were interviewed. Teacher sample sizes from each Cohort, number of districts involved and grade level of participants can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample Sizes by Cohort and Site

Site	Cohort	Total Number of Teachers	Districts	Grade Levels*									
				K	1	2	3	4	5	Sp. Ed.	MS	Int.^	Title I
Calhoun	1	5	2	1	1	--	1	1	--	1	--	--	--
	2	4	2	1	1	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--
EUP	1	4	3	1	--	1	1	--	1	--	--	--	--
	2	5	4	1	1	1	--	--	1	--	--	1	--
Mason	1	4	3	1	1	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	--
	2	5	3	--	--	1	1	1	--	--	1	--	1
Muskegon	1	5	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	--	--
	2	5	4	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	1	--
Total	**1**	**18**	**11**	**4**	**3**	**3**	**4**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**--**	**--**
	2	**19**	**13**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**--**	**1**	**2**	**1**

***Some participants teach more than one grade level**
^Int. = Interventionist

Summary and Evaluator Comments

The comments and suggestions that follow are intended to provide insights for the project team as they move forward. The comments are based on a review of and reflection on what has been learned about teacher participant experiences with Math Recovery®. Evaluator comments have been organized thematically and are followed by summaries from the interviews.

Teacher Impacts. Respondents generally expressed positive responses to their participation in Math Recovery® activities. The sampled teachers felt that they had increased their knowledge of early numeracy, math content, and how to teach math. Many stated that the most rewarding aspects of the program involved seeing improvements in their students' mathematical abilities, especially those who previously struggled, as well as learning different ways to teach math. Teachers also found using the games/manipulatives worthwhile.

- **Motivation.** Most teachers participated to increase their knowledge of math content, instruction, practices, or strategies (43%). Some were motivated to participate because they learned about Math Recovery® from a colleague or other outside source (38%). One Cohort 1 teacher commented, *"I find that so many of the college courses that are offered are all in that English language arts type of genre and not a lot for math. This one looked very interesting to me and that it would actually be something that would be helpful in my classroom."*

- **Knowledge of Early Numeracy.** Nearly all teachers (97%) felt their knowledge of early numeracy was enhanced by the program. Many teachers learned new ways and tools to teach math and better understand how children learn and how to help them move forward in their learning. A comment from one Cohort 2 teacher included, *"I feel that I have learned a tremendous amount about numeracy from this program. I have especially enjoyed the different strategies and games to help teach numeracy."*

- **Ability to Teach Mathematics Content.** All teachers (100%) said that their ability to teach mathematics content changed or was enhanced by the program. Teachers stated that they now have more resources, games and manipulatives to support student learning and have a better understanding of how to teach math. *"I've started to try to move toward more of a workshop model as I've learned some of the activities and games that will help support my kids,"* commented one Cohort 2 teacher.

- **Most Rewarding Aspects.** Nearly half of the teachers see the most rewarding aspects of the program to be growth or change in student success, especially struggling students (49%) or learning more about teaching math in different ways and how to help students learn the skills they need to move to the next level (46%). In addition, teachers see the games/manipulatives as worthwhile and the students enjoy them (19%).

  Twice as many teachers from Cohort 1 reported growth or change in student success than Cohort 1; this may be due to the shorter time Cohort 2 teachers had to implement the materials. Twice as many Cohort 2 teachers said they learned more about teaching math in different ways and how to help students learn the skills they need to move to the next level than Cohort 1 teachers. One Cohort 1 teacher commented, *"My students are making really good gains in math and they are mathematical thinkers, they're mathematicians and they can do the math talk."*

- **Other Comments or Experiences.** When asked what else they wanted to say about Math Recovery® or their experiences with it, nearly half (49%) of teachers said it is a wonderful, enjoyable, or valuable program. Teachers also learned new math strategies and concepts to help students (22%); felt others in their district/building/in general should get this training to build continuity among all the grade levels (22%); and the instructor was amazing, knowledgeable, and available as a resource (19%). In addition, 16% of teachers would recommend it, especially to new teachers.

  A Cohort 2 teacher concluded, *"I am looking forward to next year when we can implement this school-wide. I am excited to see if we can fill in those holes in students' understanding."*

Impacts on Students. A majority of the sample of teachers we interviewed definitely felt that their students were positively impacted by their participation in Math Recovery®, both in terms of their ability to do math and in increased interest and attitudes toward math. Those who were not sure of the impact on their students seemed to think it might be too soon to make a judgement.

- Over two-thirds (70%) of teachers felt that their students' ability to do mathematics improved as a result of their involvement in Math Recovery®. Teachers who expressed this belief also said they have increased their teaching skills and strategies. As a result, their students have increased their understanding of math concepts such as number sense or structuring numbers. A Cohort 2 teacher said, "*The numbers have more of a value to my students. They understand quantity, they can visualize it, they can say it; it's just more meaningful."*

  But nearly a third (30%) of teacher participants were not sure or felt it was too soon to tell if their students' ability to do mathematics improved. Some said this was because it was their first year using Math Recovery® (8%), or that they expect to see more benefits to students in the future (8%). One Cohort 1 teacher commented, *"I can't say for sure because this is my first year teaching math knowing Math Recovery®."* This was expressed by several teachers from both cohorts.

- Over two-thirds (70%) of teachers saw changes in student interest or attitudes toward math as a result of their involvement in Math Recovery®. Teachers said students especially like the games and hands-on learning that makes math fun and have increased their confidence in math. One Cohort 1 teacher commented, *"They are more confident when it comes to math and I think that's what's driving that love for it and they love to be challenged."*

  The remaining one-third of teachers felt that their students' interest or attitudes didn't seem to change or it was hard to tell (22%) or had mixed responses (8%). These teachers are still trying to implement the program and don't feel they will be able to see change in the same students over the years. One Cohort 2 teacher added, *"I feel like next year I will see a huge change in their attitudes and interest. Right now we are just playing some games here and there and I feel like I haven't implemented the full program yet.*"

Importance of Support. The teachers we spoke to felt that the various forms of support (RtI, Building/Administrative Support) were essential to the success of implementing Math Recovery® in their schools. Many felt that their participation in Math Recovery® had had a positive change in their ability to work within RtI's. A majority also felt that support from their administrators also had a beneficial impact on their ability to participate in and implement Math Recovery® activities in their own classrooms. A minority indicated that these support structures could be improved in some ways.

- **Teacher Roles in Multi-Tiered System of Supports (RtI).** The multi-tiered system of supports (Response to Intervention) plays a major role in most schools. In our sample of teachers, some work with a team to give the assessments (19%) while others are classroom/general education teachers but work with all Tier students (16%), have additional support available to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 support (16%), or are classroom/general education teachers and provide Tier 1 support (14%).

- **Changes to Role in Multi-Tiered System of Supports (RtI).** Over two-thirds (68%) of teachers said their role in the multi-tiered system of supports (Response to Intervention) has changed as a result of their involvement in Math Recovery®. Teachers reported having a better understanding of where children are and how to further support their understanding (16%); making changes to how students are grouped to better support them (14%); and having more tools, strategies or resources to identify what students need (14%). One Cohort 2 teacher said, *"I feel like I'm able to do a better job with Tier 3 students for math because of Math Recovery®."*

- **Building/Administrator Support.** A majority (81%) of teachers felt their building administrators or principals supported them in implementing changes in classroom practice as a result of the program. Teachers said that administrators sent them to the training and plan to send others from their building (24%); they receive assistance from their ISD, facilitator, or interventionist (19%); and they are encouraged to use what they've learned from Math Recovery® and implement it in the classroom.

  Cohort 1 teachers reported receiving more assistance from their ISD, facilitator or interventionist while Cohort 2 reported having more support to attend Math Recovery® trainings. One Cohort 1 teacher said, *"[My administrator] has professional development with a Math Recovery® coach for the whole building because she really wants everybody to be aware of what it is."* One Cohort 2 teacher commented, *"[My administrator has] been part of the AVMR® training and also plans to send one team member from each grade this year."*

A small number of teachers (14%) felt their building administrators or principals did not support them in implementing changes in classroom practice as a result of the program. One teacher hasn't made many changes in the classroom yet while two other teachers haven't asked or needed support yet.

Challenges and Suggestions. The most common challenge our sample of teachers talked about was some aspect of time: time devoted to assessments, time to organize and revise curricular activities, time for planning, and time for monitoring student progress. Not surprisingly, many of their suggestions for improvement also involved time: time to put the materials/games together, especially during the training or with someone knowledgeable about Math Recovery®; scheduling PD in early or mid-summer so there is time to get organized (Cohort 2 only). Other comments included requests for better organization of the resources, more directions for the activities, that the books are difficult to read, and a need for more support from facilitators or parents/volunteers in the classroom.

- **Challenges.** Teachers said some of the challenges they have encountered include time to give the assessments without further support (32%); time to pull together materials and games, especially to support students at each construct (24%); planning time or adjusting current curriculum with Math Recovery® (16%); too much information to sort through and understand (16%); and time to implement Math Recovery® in the classroom and progress monitoring of students, especially due to completing the training late in the school year (16%, Cohort 2 only).

  More Cohort 1 teachers would like time to pull together materials and games and need more planning time or time to adjust current curriculum with Math Recovery® than Cohort 2 teachers. One of the challenges a Cohort 1 teacher mentioned was, *"Time to put the materials for the activities together so that we have them for our intervention groups."*

- **Improvement of Math Recovery®.** Teachers (19%) felt no improvements are needed or they couldn't think of anything at the time of the interview.

  Other teachers provided some ways the program could be improved. These include giving them time to put the materials/games together, especially during the training or with someone knowledgeable about Math Recovery® (14%); having it available in early or mid-summer and not during the school year so there is time to get organized (14%, Cohort 2 only); better organization of the resources, more directions for the activities and the books are difficult to read (11%); and more support from our facilitator or parents/volunteers in the classroom (11%).

  Cohort 2 teachers (14%) felt the training would be better in the summer; however, some Cohort 1 teachers (5%) wanted the training spread out throughout the school year. One Cohort 1 teacher commented, *"Allow a day for us to build the games, kind of like Teacher Talk is Make or Take days."* This idea was expressed by teachers in both cohorts.

Appendix: Summary of Individual Interview Questions

1. Why did you decide to participate in the Math Recovery® Professional Development Program?

Category	Cohort 1 (n = 18)	Cohort 2 (n = 19)	Total (n = 37)	
			No.	%
Increased my math content knowledge/instruction/practices/strategies.	9	7	**16**	**43%**
I learned about Math Recovery® from a colleague or other outside source.	6	8	**14**	**38%**
Miscellaneous.	7	5	**12**	**32%**
It was a building/district/administration decision/requirement.	5	2	**7**	**19%**
To help students increase their skills in math.	3	1	**4**	**11%**

Miscellaneous (Cohort 1):

- It was part of our priority plan. We received a grant as a Priority School. I think that's where it came from, but I'm not positive. All of our teachers in our building were able to participate.
- As an interventionist, we didn't get a choice; we were just signed up to do it. We did it in waves, and I was in the first wave.
- It was the first time it had been offered to me. I would have taken it anyway.
- Looking for credit hours.
- Also it was offered in the summer so it was more convenient than if it had been offered in the school year.
- Money was definitely a motivator for me and a number of others.
- With the grant, it made it feasible for us to go money-wise too.

Miscellaneous (Cohort 2):

- This is my first year as a math interventionist. We were actually doing curriculum development and the chance to get a grant to go to Math Recovery® training came up. Since I didn't have an actual interventionist program, I thought this was a great place to start.
- I was looking for extra math PD. That was my primary interest. As an elementary teacher, you have to take the PD times when you can get them, if you are interested in them.
- The special education teacher who was signed up for the class moved, so they had one spot. That's how I was asked to join. Of course, I jumped at the chance.
- My principal brought it to our staff's attention and asked if anyone was interested. I had not heard of it before last year, but the title caught my eye and when I read about the program I was hooked.
- It was brought to my attention by my administrator.

2. Do you feel your knowledge of early numeracy has been enhanced by the program? Why or why not?

Category	Cohort 1 (n = 18)	Cohort 2 (n = 19)	Total (n = 37)	
			No.	%
Yes.	17	19	**36**	**97%**
I learned new ways and tools to teach math.	5	6	**11**	**30%**
I understand the progression of how students learn math.	2	8	**10**	**27%**
I understand how children learn and how to help them move forward in their learning.	5	3	**8**	**22%**
My understanding of math concepts has improved.	4	4	**8**	**22%**
This should be part of college education courses.	1	1	**2**	**5%**
I have a better understanding of how children learn in the lower elementary, especially K-2.	2	--	**2**	**5%**

Category	Cohort 1 (n = 18)	Cohort 2 (n = 19)	Total (n = 37)	
			No.	%
Miscellaneous.	2	--	**2**	**5%**
No, not really. • We already had a grasp of math understanding prior to the training.	1	--	**1**	**3%**

Miscellaneous, Yes (Cohort 1):

- Oh, absolutely. It's been very interesting. There are so many ah-ha moments; I wish I had been taught that way.
- Definitely, it really helped out. I screened all my kids in structuring number in the fall and I just screened them again in January, and I could really tell. There were only a few and those were special education kids who are cognitively impaired and at a 0 or 1, but the rest of them bumped up. After we are done with that, I take my flex Fridays where we do structuring centers. I've made up different games and different activities that they can do with their specific area so they're working at their own level. They get very excited when they get to bump up a level. I've incorporated a lot of structuring and a lot of things right into my calendar and I do a lot of stuff with projectors. I'm always flashing things at them and they're getting pretty good at it. I'm asking them how they see things and having them talk. That's been a real change for me; I've been teaching Kindergarten for 19 years and this is year I'm teaching 2nd grade. It's been a learning year for me anyway but I really like the things that this has helped me with.

3. Do you think your ability to teach mathematics content has been changed or enhanced by the program? Why or why not? Can you give an example of the change or enhancement?

Category	Cohort 1 (n = 18)	Cohort 2 (n = 19)	Total (n = 37)	
			No.	%
Yes.	18	19	**37**	**100%**
I have more resources, games or manipulatives to support student learning.	9	6	**15**	**41%**
I have a better understanding of how to teach math.	6	7	**13**	**35%**
I understand the progression of how students learn math.	5	3	**8**	**22%**
Miscellaneous.	5	2	**7**	**19%**
Student understanding of math has increased.	1	5	**6**	**16%**
The assessments have helped me know where the kids are and how to move them forward.	3	1	**4**	**11%**

Miscellaneous (Cohort 1):

- Yes. I am required to have chapter five of Guided Math of Randy Zeemans read by next week. I've been really reading it, and marking up the pros and cons and how Guided Math doesn't always work with Math Recovery® because of the expectations of the district. To keep up with the Pacing Guide that goes with our math series which technically is our curriculum, I feel there's this expectation that all of us who are great teachers would be teaching the same thing at the same time, like literally day to day. So if you pop into any of our rooms, you're going to see the same exact thing at the same exact time where I think that there's not a very good understanding of some of the needs of the struggling math students. They want us to do Math Recovery® but also want us to do Guided Math and be on page 69 of our math book. It really becomes a struggle because the people coming in and making those observations don't understand as well about what we are supposed to be doing. Sometimes I think we're teaching curriculum. Sometimes I think we're teaching kids. Sometimes I think we're just making people have the Pacing Guides. It's kind of tough sometimes.

- Definitely better. I feel I'm a lot more comfortable with it. Just sitting down with my last couple SAT (Student Assistant Team) meetings for children and IEPs. Our special education teacher is taking a completely different version of Math Recovery® practices, not necessarily AVMR®, but just different things they could be doing. I tried to tell the special education teacher in September, to do this and that with my two kids, but she didn't get what I was trying to tell her. She 'knew' more than I did and didn't listen to me. So now she's coming up to me and saying, "Oh, what structuring level are they at? Now I know what this means."
- Yes. AVMR® shows you different techniques and ways to help a struggling student.
- I would say yes, it's kind of somewhat. I use a program that is similar to this. I do see some crossover between the two but this gives me more ideas to use.
- I think it's been enhanced a bit. I wish we could have had some meetings during the school year. This grant was a summer grant and with questions that arise sometimes I don't take the time to email someone and ask them a question or something I need help with because I just run out of time. So, if there was a designated time that we could meet during the school year it would have been better.

Miscellaneous (Cohort 2):

- It has. Because I'm understanding more of the why and why not kids are struggling with numbers. Things that I take for granted, like adding 3 plus 5 in my head, are not as obvious for the kids, and I'm getting a better understanding as to why. It's opened my eyes to how the kids are learning and the different types of learning that each kid has.
- I was shocked when the instructor told us that Common Core says to teach the algorithm at 4th grade. That was surprising to all of us. Now I see why. It's like the whole Common Core is making more sense to me with the Math Recovery®. I can see how they're aligned.

4. Do you think student ability to do mathematics has improved as a result of your involvement in Math Recovery®? Why or why not?

Category	Cohort 1 (n = 18)	Cohort 2 (n = 19)	Total (n = 37)	
			No.	%
Yes.	11	15	**26**	**70%**
I have increased my teaching skills and strategies.	3	7	**10**	**27%**
My students have increased their understanding of math concepts such as number sense or structuring numbers.	5	4	**9**	**24%**
I have seen student growth or improvement.	4	4	**8**	**22%**
The assessments have helped me move the children through the different constructs.	3	1	**4**	**11%**
Miscellaneous.	1	1	**2**	**5%**
I'm not sure or it's too soon to tell.	7	4	**11**	**30%**
Miscellaneous.	4	1	**5**	**14%**
This is our first year doing using Math Recovery®.	3	--	**3**	**8%**
I'll see more benefits to students next year or into the future.	--	3	**3**	**8%**
We haven't conducted the end of year assessments so we don't have the data to support that.	2	--	**2**	**5%**
My understanding of math concepts has increased.	2	--	**2**	**5%**

Miscellaneous, Yes (Cohort 1):

- Student interest seems to have increased based on polls I have taken at various times during the year. They are feeling more confident.

I'm not sure or it's too soon to tell (Cohort 1):

- But to be honest with you, we had a very solid grasp with math. Over the last two years we kind of did an intervention type model. Last year, our principal really, really pushed us in math and was a great leader in that. So, I really felt we had a good grasp of it. I will tell you that I think they've enjoyed some of the games, the new games that we've been able to put in place, but I can't really answer whether or not I think their math has improved yet.
- It seems to me that they're better at skills like number word sequences and their understanding of place value, but still working on structuring numbers that seems to be difficult for them. Knowing that is a skill they need to work on is powerful and I can help develop that. It seems that they are higher than last year's group without the Math Recovery® training. I think the practices that we've been doing have really helped, like counting circles, the subitizing, work with open number lines, has really boosted their number sequence knowing and the arrow cards have been so powerful with place value.
- I think it's too soon to tell. They said to try to implement just a little bit, like 10% coming into this to try to work it in too. It just seems too soon to tell if what we're doing is making that much of an impact. It's really hard with all the 5th grade standards and being able to fit some of these extra things in. I don't know if I'm fitting enough in or if I'm helping them enough with that.
- I do to a certain extent. This is where I struggle. The students are performing higher, but I'm not convinced it is all due to AVMR® because our building is giving more emphasis to math than it has given in past year. It's helping; I'm just not sure how much credit we can give to AVMR®.

Miscellaneous, Yes (Cohort 2):

- It was not as hands-on before and they were not as engaged and it wasn't as fun. Whereas now the games I have gotten through the program are more fun and engaging.

I'm not sure or its' too soon to tell (Cohort 2):

- I can't really say that it has because I haven't technically started doing a lot of it. I've shown them a little bit in my classroom because we did the addition and subtraction early in the fall. I teach 5th grade so I've been waiting for the multiplication and division stuff to come. Now I feel like I have some things that I can actually use with my kids. Now I do have little kids and we have an intervention specialist. There are five of us from our school that are taking this training and one of them is our intervention specialist and she's been working with those kids. She's been taking those little kids since last fall. She assesses them and she's been plugging them in and having them do Math Recovery® activities. I can say from her working with those kids, we've seen some great gains. They have moved up constructs and it's been really, really good. So it's not me personally doing it but my students have benefited from it.

5. Do you think student interest or attitudes toward math changed as a result of your involvement in Math Recovery®? Can you provide some examples?

Category	**Cohort 1** (n = 18)	**Cohort 2** (n = 19)	**Total** (n = 37)	
			No.	**%**
Yes	14	12	**26**	**70%**
The students especially like the games and hands-on learning that makes math fun.	7	7	**14**	**38%**
Students have increased confidence in math.	8	5	**13**	**35%**
Student understanding of math has changed.	--	4	**4**	**11%**
Students love math more.	2	1	**3**	**8%**
Miscellaneous.	2	1	**3**	**8%**
Not really or it's hard to tell.	2	6	**8**	**22%**

Category	Cohort 1 (n = 18)	Cohort 2 (n = 19)	Total (n = 37)	
			No.	%
Mixed response.	2	1	**3**	**8%**

Miscellaneous (Cohort 1):

- Now I have the resources to use them; I'm going in and asking my math interventionist who has been trained in Math Recovery® like for a week two winters ago in Atlanta. I think it has.
- Kids will go up and say, "This is how I solved this." And the kids will look at them and give them the thumbs up, thumbs down thing and they'll kind of look at them and they'll kind of wave their hands like wishy-washy. They're okay with that because then someone else will come up and say, "You forgot this step here." Then on the projector they'll solve it together.

Not really or it's hard to tell (Cohort 1):

- I do not think students' interests or attitudes changed, maybe because there's not that much of a difference yet. I'm hoping that next year I can implement more centers and use more. We do use some of the games and activities, but not enough yet. I think it's probably too soon to say that it has, in my opinion, at this grade level.
- It's hard to tell. I get new students every year, so the ones that like math are probably the same ones who liked it coming in. They don't groan or complain when we get ready for math class and they're pretty into it once we're going.

Mixed response (Cohort 1):

- Possibly, maybe in a roundabout way. Through the training, I have come to the conclusion that had I been taught that way or had I been offered the opportunity to learn the why and see the how of math that I now have a more positive attitude. So when my students are like, "I can't do that" or one of them said "I suck at math". I just outright told them that this is something they can do. It might take time, it might take a lot of time, but they can do this. At least in that respect, attitude adjustments kind of thing.
- I have survey kids or it's more objective. I have a sensory group that I've created. I've incorporated all of my learnings with the constructs and the activities into postural control, sensory processing, midline skills, vision, and other visual processing and focus activities with all of that. As far as my group, they say, "When are we going? Yes, let's go."

Miscellaneous (Cohort 2):

- I do think so because they seem to like it more because I can help them more.

Not really or it's hard to tell (Cohort 2):

- I'm not really sure that they are. I teach Kindergarten. They love playing the math games and they've always been interested in that. I've always tried in whatever I'm teaching to portray it as the best thing ever so they want to learn. So I think the attitude I have reflects what they're doing. I think maybe my additional interest in some of the things I've learned has helped them as well.
- I don't really think so. If you like math, you like math regardless if I'm doing something different. I don't see any attitudes changing about math or kids loving math more. What the kids love are the games. So I don't think it matters if I give them a Math Recovery® game or if I gave them just a different math game like Kaboom which is multiplication on sticks. As long as they're playing a game and they're learning, then I think that's what students like. I haven't seen anybody love math and not one kid has expressed to me that've grown to love math or they like it more. This may be because these kids are at-risk and they don't like to take risks and they know that they're lower. But, my higher level students who are grade level or above, they have not really said anything either. I'm not specifically asking them, "Do you like math more now?" I think you either like it or you don't but what they do like about Math Recovery® is the games. And, I've

talked about going to Math Recovery® and learning thee new skills and that's why we're doing them because we want you to think more in different ways not just the way that I was taught. So the kids know why they're doing it but nobody's expressed anything about how they think it's wonderful. I do have some kids that like math, but they haven't expressed that they like it more now.

- I feel like that will be next year when I will see a huge change in their attitudes and interest. Right now we are just playing some games here and there and I feel like I haven't implemented the full program yet. We just finished the last training.
- I don't know. I enjoy teaching math and I try to instill that in my kids. I try to make math a fun thing. I don't know if their attitudes and interests would be the same regardless of the Math Recovery® training or not. I think my attitude has changed. I am more excited to try these new things, but for them I don't know.
- I haven't seen a whole shift in that yet. I think next year I will be able to see that because I will have a different kind of starting mentality. Right now, I just came into this school year and everything to me was an algorithm and I just think that maybe that will change next year if I encourage from the beginning that we don't always have to use that algorithm as a tool to do multiplication, addition, and subtraction. I don't think it has really changed this year but I can see how it will in the future.
- I don't know if it has changed, but I think they are more receptive toward change. The six or seven kids I was working with were receptive to games than they were to worksheets or math stations.

Mixed response (Cohort 2):

- I think some students have been a little frustrated learning some of the strategies, but they have been mostly really positive about math.

6. Discuss your understanding of a multi-tiered system of supports (Response to Intervention/RtI) for students.

a. What role do you play in this system?

Category	**Cohort 1** (n = 18)	**Cohort 2** (n = 19)	**Total** (n = 37)	
			No.	**%**
I work with a team and give the assessments.	5	2	**7**	**19%**
I'm the classroom/general education teacher but I work with all Tier students.	1	5	**6**	**16%**
I also have additional support available to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 support.	2	4	**6**	**16%**
I'm the classroom/general education teacher and provide Tier 1 support.	4	1	**5**	**14%**
Miscellaneous.	3	2	**5**	**14%**
I work with Tier 1 and Tier 2 students.	3	1	**4**	**11%**
I work with Tier 2 and 3 students.	2	2	**4**	**11%**
I group students based on their needs.	--	4	**4**	**11%**
I work with Tier 3 students.	2	1	**3**	**8%**

Miscellaneous (Cohort 1):

- I feel like a lot times when I'm involved in these discussions, I'm kind of along for the ride. I ask questions if I have them but for the most part I'm trying to establish a frame of reference for all of the things that we do here. I tend to hang back and listen and if I have anything to add I will. For what I teach, the students at a lower construct go to see the RtI. I teach the group just beyond our math specialist.

- I honestly have no idea what that is. We're little bitty. I only have 11 students in my class so we just kind of do that all the time anyway. We don't call it that here, but I break into groups all the time and can work one-on-one just because I'm blessed to only have 11 students. It's a little easier than those who have 30 and are trying to make that happen. Most of the time I am looking to do whole group instruction but sometimes I split it up by grade, sometimes I can split it up by the couple who need to work on this concept or that concept. And sometimes I have to work one-on-one with some students. We kind of do that.
- My role is to be constantly monitoring my students and making sure I know where they're at as far as their levels of understanding so I can always meet them and take them to the next level. So, I need to be keeping track, making notes of what they're doing and strategies they're using and what they're lacking, what they have strengths in and pulling groups according to that. For example, I have a student who still has trouble with screened collections as far as a missing add-in and I know that. He's going to be given more opportunities to do that.

Miscellaneous (Cohort 2):

- We kind of have Response to Intervention here. Basically what I see and do is different testing in the classroom to label and find those kids who are struggling or are at-risk. We basically do AIMSweb testing. We use Dibbles. We have our local GLAD test and we used to use MEAP but now with the M-STEP, we never even touch that. But just to gather some data and make sure that we've got those kids and we're giving those interventions where those kids need them, that's been my part in it. We have our SAT meeting where we can talk about different interventions and things to try with the kids and I get involved with that part. But that's kind of it.
- My role is, if they're already coming in from elementary to middle school, to continue those supports that are already in place and follow whatever plan has already been given. I identify other kids to help them and get them different supports that they may need. And we do have a program here in the middle school to help students who have a weakness in math and we've talked about having the person who does that also be trained in Math Recovery®. We can see the benefit; it is eye-opening.

b. Has this changed as a result of your involvement in Math Recovery®? How?

Category	**Cohort 1** (n = 18)	**Cohort 2** (n = 19)	**Total** (n = 37)	
			No.	**%**
Yes.	11	14	**25**	**68%**
Miscellaneous.	1	6	**7**	**19%**
I have a better understanding of where children are and how to further support their understanding.	3	3	**6**	**16%**
How we group students has changed to support students more.	3	2	**5**	**14%**
I have more tools, strategies or resources to identify what students need.	3	2	**5**	**14%**
Staff within our building communicate more and share resources.	2	1	**3**	**8%**
No, not really.	5	5	**10**	**27%**
Mixed response.	2	--	**2**	**5%**

Miscellaneous (Cohort 1):

- Oh yeah, I think it's really helped me. I've been on math CRT for a lot of years. I like going to that because we always learn something new or you find another cool math website. Math is not my favorite subject, historically speaking. Language arts is my go to subject. That's why I got on the CRT; so I could get better at it. And now math is probably at least tied with language arts as my favorite.

No, not really (Cohort 1):

- I don't think it's changed too much because of Math Recovery®. We were able to test them a little differently this year because of Math Recovery® but I still do kind of the same process with the different testing that we do at our school. It changed a little bit just because of the change of the test.
- I'd say no because this is something that we've been doing anyhow, but the teaching has changed significantly. So, that's a process but the teaching has.
- Probably not.
- I don't think it has. Our school has been really focused on MTSS and trying to provide interventions for students based on data. We were a Focus School in the past and we had to go through a whole system. It's been difficult with lack of staffing to provide extra people in order to carry out our interventions.
- It has not even though we have talked about it. The 4th grade teacher and I have been trained in Math Recovery®. We felt that we should be trying to be able to offer that extra support just in our classroom so that we're focusing more with the Tier 3 group. That's not how it's working right now. The Tier 3 group is by the special education teacher. We're hoping that we can change that so that those of us who have been trained can work with those students who are in the Tier 3 to try to help boost them. They seem to need more of the support and they can benefit from some of the things from Math Recovery®. But right now it has not changed.

Mixed response (Cohort 1):

- Yes and no. No because as a resource room teacher I always teach the lowest performing students. But I work more with Tier 3 students due to the Math Recovery® training. I have extra groups of students who are low in math because of my training.
- Somewhat. As a building and district, we're in a transition time for what RTI looks like. I want my math to look more like my reading time where children are working individually at their own level and I'm working individually in small groups to target their needs. This is changing within our school because the more people who get trained the more understanding we have about it. There are so many kids that need Tier 3 support that as the classroom teacher it is hard to give that to students as much as they need.

Miscellaneous (Cohort 2):

- I'm more aware of what to look for. I can go to my math interventionist and say we, "We really need to work on skip counting." So it's change in that aspect. I feel I can be more specific with what I need.
- I feel like I'm able to do a better job with Tier 3 students for math because of Math Recovery®. Also, I'm just starting to go into the classrooms to do some of the activities with the whole class, especially some of the games and things. I'll set it up to differentiate, I'll check with the teacher about how they're doing on their daily work and what they see as far as the younger students. What they do in my school that I really hate is Mad Minutes. So I'm going into classrooms just starting to show them some other ways that students can work with structuring numbers either to five, ten, or twenty. And, then with the multiplication as well. I guess that is a change.
- Yeah, this is all really new for me. I think at the beginning of the year, having all of these things that were part of my job description but not really having any training as to how to go about it that Math Recovery® has been a really good framework to do all of these things.
- The process is still the same; however, the specialists have implemented Math Recovery® work into their work with students.
- As it becomes easier for them, I can change things for them to make it more challenging. Math Recovery® has helped me to make things more challenging for them.

- As for changes, I have a pretty full load, but I feel students are now more in charge of the groups; they share their thinking, come up to the board and show different examples. So I have more student-led groups now.

No, not really (Cohort 2):

- No, not really. Coming from the special education world, I know the at-risk or the resource room kids need me the most, those are the kids that need the support the most. So that part hasn't changed for Math Recovery®. What's changed is learning how the kids learn, the skills that they need, that has changed. Making those games that can help boost my kids from a concept two to a three. Those were all the pieces we were missing. That has changed and that part I have incorporated into my class. To me that's very important, but it's very hard to make those materials and do all of the assessing because you're not just assessing grade level, you have to stack assess and finding a time for that is very hard.
- I would have to again say probably not at this point because I haven't really started using it in my classroom. I'm at the point now where I had to write goals yesterday and one of the goals I wrote was I need to reorganize how I do things; I need to get all of my manipulatives out of the cupboards and get them there so those kids can use them. I think that's going to improve those kids. Those kids are going to get a lot more conceptual understanding and have a much better number sense I think.
- No. I've always done this and that's the expectation of the school. Maybe my intervention teaching has improved a bit but the fact that I've always done Tier 1 and 2 in my classroom hasn't changed.
- Not a lot this year. I think next year we'll see a lot of different changes. I know that the Title team is using Math Recovery® for assigning the groups for 1st grade, so next year coming into 1st grade we will kind of have a good idea of where we're at using the Math Recovery® assessments. Hopefully we can get the rest of the 2nd grade team trained so we can do that with all of the 2nd grade also next year.
- It has not changed. It is going to, however. I am trying to develop a schedule to incorporate Math Recovery® into our school, school-wide.

7. Have your building administrators or principals supported you in implementing changes in classroom practice as a result of the program? Can you provide some examples?

Category	**Cohort 1** (n = 18)	**Cohort 2** (n = 19)	**Total** (n = 37)	
			No.	**%**
Yes.	13	17	**30**	**81%**
My administrator is the one who sent/supported me to attend the training and plans to send others from my building.	2	7	**9**	**24%**
We receive assistance from our ISD, facilitator, or interventionist.	6	1	**7**	**19%**
Miscellaneous.	3	3	**6**	**16%**
My administrator wants us to use what we've learned from Math Recovery® and implement it in the classroom.	2	4	**6**	**16%**
My administrator provided financial support for extra materials I need or subs for the assessments.	1	4	**5**	**14%**
My administrator gives us more time to collaborate and discuss the Math Recovery® strategies.	3	2	**5**	**14%**
We've observed other teachers who are using Math Recovery® in their classroom.	--	2	**2**	**5%**

Category	Cohort 1 (n = 18)	Cohort 2 (n = 19)	Total (n = 37)	
			No.	%
No, not really.	4	1	**5**	**14%**
Mixed response.	1	1	**2**	**5%**

Miscellaneous (Cohort 1):

- Yeah, he's very good about stuff like that and what I'm doing. Well, when we had the 11 administrators in my classroom and several administrators, not just mine, but other administrators wanting to send their teachers to see me. After being in my room, they… And one them asked, and I had to be done because I hurt my ankle this year and she's been trying to reschedule. So I have a couple teachers that have been trying to get into my classroom just to see how I'm doing things a little bit differently. My administrator is kind of supporting us and other administrators saw what I was doing when I did that lesson and have asked to come in and my principal has been very supportive about that as much as he can. Administrators coming from all over the [the district] because part of the AVMR® wanting support because this summer, part of that was administrators needed to have a feel for what this was like in the classroom and what they could do to support, not necessary evaluate the lesson they made me but to…If they see it, they know what stuff principals of AVMR®. So they have these eleven administrators come into the classroom partake in part of it and whatnot. They were all very pleased. The kids were all very on task; it was kind of cool.
- He's been very encouraging. He doesn't do anything to support it, just encourages us to keep current and up-to-date in professional development. I think he's been attending administrator support training. I would like to see our administration put more resources into making Math Recovery® a priority in our school. Need staffing, money for tools, to pay people to become trained. In the past they weren't willing to pay for people to get training, they had to do it on their own time. I would like to see them pay people the hourly wage to go get trained. There is a problem with cutting instructional interventionists hours, so they don't have to provide insurance, and can't get them to PD.
- I'm getting other strategies but I would like to go out and see other teachers and it's hard to get out of the building to do that because we're short on subs in our district.

No, not really (Cohort 1):

- No. I have no further comment about that.
- No. Well, I haven't made any huge changes in my classroom. I'm sure that my principal would be supportive of that. I do know of a few other teachers in my school that have been using Math Recovery® and testing their Kindergartners and our administrator has allowed one of our ESD supports to come in and help in those classrooms. It's just that I haven't made any big changes to my classroom.
- We do have a principal. I don't know, I guess it's just her personality but bless her heart she just kind of allows us to do what we need to do and just kind of stays out of our way. I don't want that to sound bad; it's a good thing but I can't say that she's really done much with us about this since we've taken it. We kind of more just help each other out. If we have a question, or what do you think about this, you just want to bounce something off somebody else, like I said, all four of us are the four teachers who do K-5, we just help each other. Our principal just kind of stays out of it.
- I haven't really asked for any support, so probably no. I'm not saying she wouldn't if I wanted her to because she is supportive of Math Recovery® and of what we are doing in the class. I'm not sure how much she knows about it except that she had to take a course

Mixed response (Cohort 1):

- Yes and no. Yes, she is all for Math Recovery®. She says she's been trained in Math Recovery®. She says that she has implemented some Math Recovery® at the middle school level, but she is new to the building. She is the one who is locked into keeping all the teachers on the same exact page and your Guided Math rotations need to look similar to the other two colleagues and I don't know how that would be possible. A rotation or two, for example fractions is coming up and due to start Thursday. There should be a mini lesson and a station on some fractions but the way the fractions would look with each group going through isn't going to be the same. But yet, that's kind of what she wants. She wants teacher choice to be the student activity pages out of the book no matter which group I've had. And, if I wanted to have an extra rotation of some kids who I think need to double dip, because I still have a handful of kids that are really struggling to do like an 8+8; she doesn't want to see that in a guided math group/workshop. I'm like, "You say you understand it. You say you recommend it, but you're not recognizing that I'm data driven with my kids." And if I try to do fractions, for example, with some of these kids, they're just going to look at me like, "I don't know what you're talking about."

Miscellaneous (Cohort 2):

- Absolutely. She is more than encouraging of us going and learning about it and wants to hear what different things that we're doing and loves to come in and see how it's changed the way that we teach kids math.
- Yes. Our administrators have gone to their own meetings on Math Recovery®. Several teachers have organized a Math Recovery® night where parents will be coming in and learning some of the games and where they can ask questions, and administrators have approved that. Those are the things that I have seen.
- No one has been brought in to help us or anything like that. We do get 10 hours; we just haven't used them yet. So, not really, no.

No, not really (Cohort 2):

- There has not been that much involvement from the administration yet. They have not had time to come in and observed and seen what we are doing. The school principal did inquiry that she wanted to come in and watch, but hasn't yet.

Mixed response (Cohort 2):

- Our building administrator is brand new this year, first time as an administrator. I think that I'm sure that she will support me in implementing any changes that are needed. She wants all of us within the building to use the math screener and expects us to do that three times a year. We haven't had our follow up training in our district with our trainer yet and I'm pretty confident that after that happens, then she's going to see more of the areas to support us and do what's best for our kids. Long and short, yes she will, but I just haven't really asked for that and we as a group haven't built that plan yet.

8. What are the most rewarding aspects of the program?

Category	**Cohort 1** (n = 18)	**Cohort 2** (n = 19)	**Total** (n = 37)	
			No.	**%**
I see growth or change in student success, especially struggling students.	12	6	**18**	**49%**
I learned more about teaching math in different ways and how to help students learn the skills they need to move to the next level.	5	12	**17**	**46%**
The games/manipulatives are worthwhile and the students	3	4	**7**	**19%**

Category	Cohort 1 (n = 18)	Cohort 2 (n = 19)	Total (n = 37)	
			No.	%
enjoy them.				
Using the assessments to see where students are at.	2	3	**5**	**14%**
Students are more confident about math.	3	--	**3**	**8%**
Sharing experiences/information with staff and other math teachers.	3	--	**3**	**8%**
Miscellaneous.	1	--	**1**	**3%**

Miscellaneous (Cohort 1):

- What also is really, really good and has been helpful are the resources. All of the books, all of the activities, and the trainings. The trainings have been really, really good that we started right before school started. So then we can apply that immediately. There was one training I went through a while ago, it was like in the end of June and then we have the rest of the summer; I'm not going to remember what we ended up doing. And then periodically, having additional sessions brings it right back and fresh in our minds again so we can keep applying those new skills.

9. What are some of the challenges you have encountered?

Category	Cohort 1 (n = 18)	Cohort 2 (n = 19)	Total (n = 37)	
			No.	%
Time to give the assessments without further support to the classroom.	6	6	**12**	**32%**
Time to pull together materials and games, especially to support students at each construct.	7	2	**9**	**24%**
Miscellaneous.	2	6	**8**	**22%**
Planning time or adjusting current curriculum with Math Recovery®.	5	1	**6**	**16%**
There was too much information to sort through and understand.	3	3	**6**	**16%**
Time to implement Math Recovery® in the classroom and progress monitoring of students, especially due to completing the training late in the school year.	--	6	**6**	**16%**
More classroom, financial, or administrator/district support.	3	1	**4**	**11%**
Where to put the manipulatives/games to make them more accessible for the children.	2	1	**3**	**8%**
It's not clear what to do or which constructs to use next after the assessments are complete.	2	--	**2**	**5%**
Students are bored with it or are not getting anything out of it.	1	1	**2**	**5%**
The resources are not user friendly and not organized well, especially reading the books, finding the resources online, or instructions for the games.	1	--	**1**	**3%**

Miscellaneous (Cohort 1):

- For me personally, it felt like a slow paced program in the beginning. The state is breathing down our necks to improve our tests, and we should be doing all this stuff. But on the flip side, if students don't have the basic knowledge of numbers, they are not going to go anywhere. It was such a different way of teaching that we weren't used to it. Change is hard, as they say. This was our first year doing it and we were struggling a bit until we just jumped in and got used to it.

- Finding time to do it and trying to remember all of it and finding time to read the book. It's time mainly.

Miscellaneous (Cohort 2):

- I have seen some small backlash from parents on some of the "Common Core" strategies for solving addition and subtraction problems.
- Probably the biggest one for me is change isn't easy. I've been doing this 25 years and I've never done this before and it's like okay now I've got to change my mindset. I've got to change the way I'm teaching and organize my classroom differently, and that takes time.
- I can't think of any.
- I don't know. Our instructor has been really supportive. I don't know if I would say I have any challenges right now. Every time we've had a question about anything, she's answers it right away. She offers to come in and help us.
- Just knowing what I could use effectively in my classroom or with my students and what really was going to be, not a waste of my time, but wasn't going to give me much information. I was actually shocked how much it did give me information, even at some of those lower level assessments.
- And, I think the other challenge is to maybe share some of the paradigm shifts that I've had in thinking with the general education teachers because without the teachers sometimes it's hard to show them where I'm coming from.

10. How might the Math Recovery® Professional Development Program be improved?

Category	**Cohort 1** (n = 18)	**Cohort 2** (n = 19)	**Total** (n = 37)	
			No.	**%**
Miscellaneous.	4	5	**9**	**24%**
No improvements are needed or I can't think of anything.	2	5	**7**	**19%**
Give us time to put the materials/games together, especially during the training or with someone knowledgeable about Math Recovery®.	3	2	**5**	**14%**
Have it available in early or mid-summer and not during the school year so there is time to get organized.	--	5	**5**	**14%**
Better organization of the resources, more directions for the activities and the books are difficult to read.	3	1	**4**	**11%**
More support from our facilitator or parents/volunteers in the classroom.	2	2	**4**	**11%**
Make this an application of Math Recovery® course and how to use it in the classroom.	2	1	**3**	**8%**
Have classroom visits to teachers who have been implementing Math Recovery® in their classroom.	2	1	**3**	**8%**
Don't offer it in the summer and spread sessions throughout the school year.	2	--	**2**	**5%**
Have meeting times during the school year to discuss what's working for other teachers and problems they are encountering.	2	--	**2**	**5%**
More of my colleagues in my school/district trained in Math Recovery®.	1	1	**2**	**5%**
Condense the training into fewer days.	1	--	**1**	**3%**

Miscellaneous (Cohort 1):

- Refresher courses are a must. If teachers don't have those refresher courses, then when it is overwhelming they will say, "Well, I'm just not going to do it." The refresher courses should ask, "Where are you?" and "What are your next steps?"
- Make [our facilitator] teach it all. She's phenomenal, I love her. She's real down to earth and she makes it clear and she'll put the extra mile in and stuff. The other teacher that I've seen I was just kind of like, "You what?"
- One of the things is the diagnostics. Some of those diagnostics are identifying some of those lower kids who need it. Some of those diagnostics are really hard for those kids. Once they don't pass that first question, they're basically done. Some of them are just too hard for those low kids. Maybe shorten some of those PD days and then turn them into those Make and Take days would be about the only suggestions I have.
- I don't know how necessary that the math program itself could improve to get teachers to come but I know that the first week was really based on Kindergarten through 2nd grade learning. I enjoyed it because I'm a math teacher and I enjoy math. I also teach little ones during summer school, but the second week applied to me more with the multiplication, division, and higher place value concepts. So, maybe making different sessions for lower elementary and upper elementary. I loved the program.

Miscellaneous (Cohort 2):

- I would wish if I could change something it would be to have the classes closer together, but that's in a perfect world. Not really.
- The only hard part is the assessments. I don't know if there's an easier way to do that or if there's an easier assessment. I know it's pretty tough to get all that information from a student but it's definitely a challenge to fit that in somehow.
- It was a lot of information in too little time so it was overwhelming at times.
- Course 2 in a second year.
- Also, follow-up with how we can challenge different kids at different levels with the same games.

11. What else do you have to say about Math Recovery® or your experiences with it?

Category	**Cohort 1** (n = 18)	**Cohort 2** (n = 19)	**Total** (n = 37)	
			No.	**%**
It's a wonderful/enjoyable/valuable program.	9	9	**18**	**49%**
Miscellaneous.	11	3	**14**	**38%**
I learned new math strategies/concepts to help students.	4	4	**8**	**22%**
Others in my district/building/in general should get this training to build continuity among all the grade levels.	3	5	**8**	**22%**
The instructor was amazing/knowledgeable/available as a resource.	2	5	**7**	**19%**
I would recommend it, especially for new teachers.	2	4	**6**	**16%**
Getting the materials together, reading the books, and giving the assessments have been time-consuming.	4	--	**4**	**11%**
It was a positive experience.	2	2	**4**	**11%**
My students are benefiting.	2	1	**3**	**8%**

Miscellaneous (Cohort 1):

- No, I don't think so.
- [Our facilitator] says they're working on a new test that would be 15 minutes to get a more overall picture of your kids. I'm looking forward to that. And, I'm hoping there is money to pull us in to show us that new test they're developing now. I think that would be very valuable

because that would give you more overall picture of how they're doing in math and not just picking that one area. I am very pleased.
- I'm just easing myself into it, but I believe in what they taught me.
- It made me think about math a lot differently. Our ESD support has been a big support in holding the follow up PLCs.
- I will keep trying to use it, but again, I wish it were more clear.
- I love having the ability to test the students to see where they are at. I hope to be able to fit more of that in and to use more of it and to see the benefits of it. It's just putting all of the pieces in place; that's what I'm hoping to do more of next year.
- I'm really grateful to have this knowledge and it makes me want to learn more. I'm doing the interventionist training next year. I'm glad to have this experience under my belt. It makes me more marketable and may open up a few doors.
- I wish everyone in my building felt the same way which I know is impossibility and that's not even within their realm of ...Some people were trained years ago and are like, "No, no, it's terrible. We don't need it." But those of us who've been trained more recently are like are just like, "This is excellent. This is phenomenal." So I don't know exactly what the difference is but I guess I would just like to see in the training more on the ground how would you teach this lesson, what does it look like or what does it look like even in a 4th grade or 5th grade classroom where kids are supposed to be beyond this. They're supposed to be done with this stuff by 3rd grade. What does it look like for us or what are some specific lesson plans that we could use. More of just this is what it looks like on the ground running.
- It was a lot of time, lot of work, very intense this summer.
- So not only is the initial, here's all this, now we're going to support you along the way, so that was the biggest part that I liked. The five days right before school that was very, very good so it just stays fresh in your mind.
- It started out to be a love-hate relationship. It was slow-paced and people were breathing down our necks saying, "You got to reach this level!"

Miscellaneous (Cohort 2):
- I just wanted to underline that we loved working with students during the course to learn the assessments. I thought that was really important. We loved the books; we thought that they were very helpful, probably because [our facilitator] helped us tab them so that was user-friendly. We liked the videos. We were really happy with the fact that, at first we were scared when she said, "You're working with students on the second or third day," and we said, "What?" But boy, that's hands-on learning. That was the fasted learning I've ever done. We loved that. It's priceless.
- There are always challenges to any program, like time and resources. But I am looking forward to next year when we can implement this school-wide. I am excited to see if we can fill in those holes in students' understanding.
- And I just hope that we continue to get support because I feel like if I'm just left on my own. There was just so much to learn. And to be honest, after the training is done and I go back to my classroom and I get to deal with reading and science and social studies on top of math, I can't just dedicate myself to studying math and reviewing and reading everything. As much as I have the intentions of doing that, it doesn't always happen. Then I feel like I'm not progressing as much as I could as a teacher and facilitator.