*This advisory recommendation has not been approved by the Instructional Quality Commission or the State Board of Education*

# Review Panel Advisory Recommendation2025 Mathematics Instructional Materials Adoption

| **Publisher** | **Program** | **Grade Level(s)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Savvas Learning Company | *enVision+ California Integrated Mathematics I* | **Mathematics I** |

## Program Summary:

The *enVision+ California Integrated Mathematics I* program includes the following: SE = Student Edition; TE = Teacher’s Edition; PO = Program Overview; ASB = Assessment Sourcebook; AR:HG = Additional Resources: Hands-On Games; AR:SRP = Additional Resources: Skills Review & Practice; AR:EPC = Additional Resources: EP&C Handbook; AR:EPCTG = Additional Resources: EP&C Handbook Teacher's Guide; AR:SQ = Additional Resources: STEAMQuest; AR:AC = Additional Resources: Amazing Contributions; AR:SC = Additional Resources: Student Companion; AR:TRO = Additional Resources: Teacher Resource Originals; AR:CSPTG = Additional Resources: California Standards Practice Teacher's Guide; AR:MW = Additional Resources: Math Walk video; AR:RBRC = Rubrics; AR:DA = Additional Resources: Interactives Powered by Desmos Tools; AR: MM3A = Additional Resources: Math Modeling in 3 Acts multimedia.

## Recommendation:

*enVision+ California Integrated Mathematics I* is not recommended for adoption for Mathematics 1 because it is not aligned with the *California Common Core State Standards for Mathematics* (*CA CCSSM*); it does not meet all of the evaluation criteria in category 1, but shows strengths in categories 2–5.

### Criteria Category 1: Mathematics Content/Alignment with Standards

The program does not support teaching to the *CA CCSSM* for the intended grade level(s) in alignment with the *Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*. The program does not meet all of the evaluation criteria in category 1.

#### Citations:

* Criterion 1.1: Standards Not Met:
	+ - N-Q.1: SE/TE, pp. 5–12, 49–55, 62–67, 88, 90, 142, 155, 185, 192, 235, 279, 396. TE, pp. 279B, 415C. The program does not explicitly call for students to interpret the origin in graphs and data displays.
		- F-IF.6: SE, pp. 386–393, 410; TE, pp. 386A–393B, 410, 412–415C. The program does not explicitly call for students to estimate the rate of change from a graph at the point of instruction or during student practice.
		- G-CO.1: TE/SE, pp. 123A–130B, 131A–139B, 140A–145B. The program, as submitted for review, did not include a precise definition of “circle.”
		- G-CO.4: TE/SE, pp. 284, 289, 300. The program does not require students to develop precise definitions of “rotations,” “reflections,” and “translations” in terms of angles, circles, perpendicular lines, parallel lines, and line segments. Descriptions were provided as a list of properties without discussion, analysis, or investigation.
		- F-BF.3: TE, pp. 239A–245B, 401A–407B, 411. The program, as submitted for review, did not include explicit experimentation with cases using technology.
* Criterion 1.2: SE, pp. 21–22. Chapter 5 of the *Mathematics Framework* (p. 9) cites GAISE II, which states: “Data collection designs must acknowledge variability in data” (GAISE II, p. 14). SE, pp. 21–22, Examples 2–4, data collection design that is inconsistent with the guidance. According to Chapter 8 (p. 10) of the *Mathematics Framework,* “[High school] Graduates should propose ways to validly collect data to answer statistical investigative questions.” The cited examples illustrate invalid data collection; the program describes sampling practices that are inconsistent with prior grade-level standards, and the sequence is misaligned in its addressing of a single standard (S.ID.2) while the context and ​​narrative contradict previous learning (7.SP.1) as described in the Framework: “Students must be encouraged and supported to draw on whatever past knowledge and understandings they bring into an activity and to persevere through (and perhaps beyond) the activity’s target mathematical practice and content goals” (p. 11).
* Criterion 1.2: SE, p. 289: Program includes imprecise definitions in its treatment of congruence and definitions of rigid motions and does not build on prior understandings. The program does not provide students with opportunities to develop precise definitions of terms, nor to prove conjectures from those definitions, as called for in the framework.
* Criterion 1.2: TE, p. 117: The program provides projects and data related to real-world applications at the conclusion of a learning sequence. The materials submitted did not provide inquiry-based activities. The Math Modeling in 3 Acts did not include language supports to provide access for all students (e.g., TE, p. 113).

### Criteria Category 2: Program Organization

The organization and features of the instructional materials support instruction and learning of the standards.

#### Citations:

* + Criterion 2.6: SE, pp. 3, 5, G2–G26, N1–N5
	+ Criterion 2.7: SE, pp. 5, 12, and at the beginning of every lesson
	+ Criterion 2.8: TE, pp. xxiii (Pacing for Success), xxv–xxvi (Assessment Resources); AR:SC
	+ Criterion 2.9: TE, California Common Core State Standards: Mathematics in enVision+, pp. C2–C8; TE Standards for Mathematical Practice in enVision+, pp. C9–C12

### Criteria Category 3: Assessment

The instructional materials contain strategies and tools for continually assessing student understanding and opportunities for new learning.

#### Citations:

* + Criterion 3.1: Assessment Sourcebook, Lesson 1-2, Exit Ticket
	+ Criterion 3.2: Assessment Sourcebook, pp. 46–48, Big Ideas Performance Task 2 Scoring Guide
	+ Criterion 3.3: SE, p. 405, Lesson 9-4, Do You UNDERSTAND?
	+ Criterion 3.4: TE, p. 199, Lesson 5-3: Exit Ticket Support
	+ Criterion 3.5: Assessment Sourcebook Progress Monitoring Assessment, Forms A, B, and C
	+ Criterion 3.6: Program Overview Assessment Resources, pp. 40–41

### Criteria Category 4: Access and Equity

Program resources incorporate recognized principles, concepts, and research-based strategies to meet the needs of all students and provide equal access to learning through lessons that are relevant to the students. Instructional resources include suggestions for teachers on how to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students who are at-promise, advanced learners, and students with learning disabilities. However, supports for multilingual learners are not consistent with the California *English Language Development Standards* for students at Emerging or Bridging levels, particularly with regard to inappropriate or inadequate scaffolds for the level.

#### Citations:

* + Criterion 4.2: TE, p. 298A, Lesson 7-2: Quick Check Differentiated Practice Support.
	+ Criterion 4.2: TE, p. 330, Lesson 8-1: Support Student Understanding and Extend Student Thinking.
	+ Criterion 4.6: TE, p. 21, Lesson 1-3: Extend Student Thinking.
	+ Criterion 4.6: AR:TRO, p. 26, Lesson 2-2: Enrichment.
	+ Criterion 4.7: AR:SC, p. 17 (e.g., workspace is provided, text in blue ink).

### Criteria Category 5: Instructional Planning and Support

The instructional materials contain a clear road map to assist teachers when planning instruction for the specific needs and context of their students. The instructional resources support Universal Design for Learning and culturally and linguistically responsive instruction to improve and optimize teaching and make learning more equitable.

#### Citations:

* + Criterion 5.2: TE, pp. 5A–11B
	+ Criterion 5.3: TE, p. xxiii; TE, pp. 2E–2F
	+ Criterion 5.4: TE, Topic Planner (e.g., pp. 2E–2F)
	+ Criterion 5.5: Assessment Sourcebook (e.g., rubrics, answers, and scoring)
	+ Criterion 5.7: Additional Practice, digital version available online (e.g., TE, p. 400B)

## Edits and Corrections:

The panel recommends the following edits and corrections:

| **#** | **Grade level** | **Component** | **Page number or URL** | **Current text** | **Proposed corrected text** | **Reason for edit** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Int. M1 | TE | xiii | Missing | G-GPE.7 | Standard is missing from the map. |
| 2 | Int. M1 | TE 1 | p. 227 | “one to one relationship” | “special type of relationship” | Original is incorrect. |
| 3 | M1 | TE 1 | p. 95 | “the coefficient… so an increase in m…” | “The coefficient…, so an increase in magnitude of m…” | The original statement is incorrect for m<1. |
| 4 | M1 | SE | p. 12 | “Stacy and Diego both have a athletic shoes” | “Stacy and Diego both have a pair of athletic shoes.” | Grammatical |
| 5 | Int. M1 | TE 2 | p. 342 | Answer to #25 is incorrect | (construction) | Incorrect answer in the TE |
| 6 | M1 | SE | p. 243 | *g*(*x*)=*k*(−*x*)+2 | *g*(*x*)= −(*kx*)+2 | To match language of heading example 3B |
| 7 | M1 | SE | p. 293 | *T*<–11,6> \* *T*<7, -3> (*x,y*) | (*T*<–11,6>\**T*<7, –3>)(*x,y*) | Accuracy |
| 8 | M1 | SE | p. 300 | The image of P is P’ | The image of P is P | Accuracy |
| 9 | M1 | TE, SE | pp. 20–8, 31, 34, 44 | Histograms with interval labels for bins. | Histogram for a continuous variable should have its bins labeled using cut points instead of intervals. | Accuracy. For example, on p. 24, the bins for cost are labeled as 18–19, 20–21, etc. So, where does $19.50 cost go? It’s neither between 18–19 now 20–21. |

## Social Content Citations:

None.
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