

# How Well Do My Mathematics Instructional Materials Support English Learners?

As the number of English learners in U.S. schools grows, it becomes imperative to provide rigorous, grade-level, high quality instructional materials that support all learners in achieving equitable learning outcomes. Rather than just checking off curricular goals, development and continuous improvement should be about deeply considering the support aspects of your instructional materials. This inventory is intended for those developing, procuring, or using mathematics instructional materials and for those who want to create better learning conditions and academic outcomes for English Learners (ELs). You may complete this inventory independently or in discussion with colleagues.

For the questions below, consider the extent to which the mathematics instructional materials under review currently meet the needs of ELs and how you would explain your answers using specific examples from these materials. Choose the answer that best reflects your rating of that support aspect based on the evidence you find. Then use the summary below to decide next steps.

Area of Focus I: Interdependence of Mathematical Content, Practices, and Language					
1. Do the instructional materials afford regular opportunities for students to revisit and revise their <i>language</i> and <i>mathematical thinking</i> ?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent opportunities	2. Limited opportunities	3. Some opportunities	4. Substantial opportunities	5. Consistent and high-quality opportunities
2. Are mathematics <b>and</b> language goals organized into an intentional progression in the instructional materials?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent progression	2. Limited evidence of intentional progression	3. Some evidence of intentional progression	4. Substantial evidence of intentional progression	5. Consistent evidence of intentional progression
3. Do the instructional materials guide students to consistently and strategically communicate (speak, listen, read, and write) about mathematics? And for specific purposes?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent guidance	2. Limited guidance/Limited evidence of a specific academic purpose	3. Some guidance/Some evidence of a specific academic purpose	4. Substantial guidance/Substantial evidence of specific academic purposes	5. Consistent and strategic guidance/Consistent evidence of clear academic purposes

<b>Area of Focus II: Scaffolding and Supports for Simultaneous Development</b>					
4. Do the instructional materials show evidence of asking students to produce, interpret, and make connections between various mathematical representations?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent evidence	2. Limited evidence	3. Some evidence	4. Substantial evidence	5. Consistent and high-quality evidence
5. How often do the instructional materials guide configuration of students in whole-group, small group, pairs, and individual work? How are teachers guided to strategically use that time to support ELs?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent guidance	2. Limited guidance	3. Some guidance	4. Substantial guidance	5. Consistent and high-quality guidance
6. Do the instructional materials provide teachers with guidance to anticipate and manage relevant language demands and opportunities?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent guidance	2. Limited guidance	3. Some guidance	4. Substantial guidance	5. Consistent and high-quality guidance

<b>Area of Focus III: Mathematical Rigor Through Language</b>					
7. Do the instructional materials afford students opportunities to engage in purposeful uses of mathematical practices? How are teachers guided in supporting them?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent opportunities and guidance	2. Limited opportunities and guidance	3. Some engagement opportunities and guidance	4. Substantial engagement opportunities and guidance	5. Consistent and high-quality engagement opportunities and guidance
8. Do the instructional materials offer strategies to consistently maintain productive mathematical struggle for ELs?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent	2. Limited strategies offered	3. Some strategies offered	4. Substantial strategies offered	5. Consistent and high-quality strategies offered
9. Are teachers well supported in cultivating and facilitating meaningful mathematical discussions between students in the instructional materials?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent	2. Limited support	3. Some support	4. Substantial support	5. Consistent and high-quality support

<b>Area of Focus IV: Leveraging Students' Assets</b>					
10. Is guidance provided to use contexts for connecting mathematics to students' lived experiences?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent	2. Limited guidance	3. Some guidance	4. Substantial guidance	5. Consistent and high-quality guidance
11. Are resources provided to challenge teachers to reflect on their own values and beliefs in regard to language and learning?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent	2. Limited opportunities to reflect	3. Some opportunities to reflect	4. Substantial opportunities to reflect	5. Consistent and high-quality opportunities to reflect
12. How often and how effectively are activities structured to encourage students to use their existing language toolkits to participate (rather than use prerequisite language as a barrier to getting started)?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Never/Non-existent	2. Infrequently/Limited effectiveness	3. Sometimes/Somewhat effective	4. Often/Substantially effective	5. Consistently/Highly effectively

<b>Area of Focus V: Assessment of Mathematical Content, Practices, and Language</b>					
13. Are models provided of students engaged in mathematical practices? How varied are the examples of language proficiency in those models?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent models	2. Limited models/Limited variety	3. Some models/Some variety	4. Substantial models/Substantial variety	5. Consistent and high-quality models/Consistent variety
14. Are assessments structured to capture students' growth and progress with both mathematics and language?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent evidence	2. Limited evidence	3. Some evidence	4. Substantial evidence	5. Consistent and high-quality evidence
15. Are teachers guided to use quality formative assessment of both mathematics and language to make instructional decisions?					
Instructional Materials Rating:	1. Non-existent guidance	2. Limited guidance	3. Some guidance	4. Substantial guidance	5. Consistent and high-quality guidance

If you rated the support aspects at mostly 4s and 5s, then you are off to a good start! Consider more robust ways of supporting ELs in your context. With effective implementation, these materials can affect EL student mathematics outcomes positively and create more equitable learning conditions. To explore more specific details about how these aspects are operationalized effectively in instructional materials and to explore strategies, activities, and other resources, please visit our English Learners Success Forum (ELSF) [Guidelines for Improving Mathematics Materials for English Learners](#).

The support aspects that you rated at 3 or below are places to further explore in the materials improvement process. The ELSF [Guidelines document](#) contains the fifteen mathematics instructional materials Guidelines that correspond with the question numbers in this inventory. These Guidelines include specifications that unpack the features of curriculum that meet the mathematical learning needs of ELs. These Guidelines also include links to activities, strategies, and other resources which may be helpful in the materials improvement process. You might utilize this document to create an improvement plan for your instructional materials.