

EFFECT OF “EVERYDAY MATHEMATICS” CURRICULUM
ON STUDENT MATH PROFICIENCY RATES
AMONG MICHIGAN PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A research study conducted by Andy Thomas, a Burns Park parent, investigated how the use of “Everyday Mathematics” (EDM) affects student proficiency in math. Data was extracted for the 75 largest school districts in Michigan (excluding Detroit), using the www.schoolsmatter.com database. The following conclusions were reached:

- Districts that utilize EDM have a higher math proficiency rate than districts that use other math curricula.
- The higher proficiency rates associated with use of EDM is present among economically disadvantaged children and racial minorities.
- The higher proficiency rates associated with EDM are strongest for the least disadvantaged districts (in terms of number of economically disadvantaged children, level of parental education and percent of single-parent households in district).
- The difference in proficiency rates between districts that use EDM and those that do not decreases for more disadvantaged districts.
- The “achievement gap” between white and African-American students is smaller for districts using EDM than for districts that use other math programs.
- No evidence was found to suggest that EDM systematically disadvantages any socio-economic group.

While this study is unlikely to end the controversy surrounding EDM, opponents of EDM will be hard pressed to find anything in this data to support their criticism. It should be kept in mind that this study considered grouped data only. It did not address the question of how individual students react to EDM. Parents may still be the best judges of how well EDM meets their children’s needs. Still, when taken as a whole, the results of this study represent a solid endorsement of EDM as a math curriculum for elementary students.

A summary of the data appears on the following pages.

STUDENT MATH PROFICIENCY		
Category	District Using EDM	Districts Not Using EDM
All Students	70.0%	63.8%
Male Students*	71.9%	64.3%
Female Students*	71.7%	63.7%
White Students	76.5%	70.0%
African-American Students	43.0%	36.2%
Economically Disadvantaged Students	49.3%	46.9%
Districts	30	45

* The number of male and female students per district was not available; therefore, these statistics represent the average of male/female student proficiencies for all districts. The average was not adjusted for differences in district size, causing a slight distortion. This is the reason the averages for both male and female students are higher than the average for “all students” (which does reflect differences in district size).

MATH PROFICIENCY BY PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHO ARE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED		
District Ranking	Use EDM	Do Not Use EDM
Least Disadvantaged Third	83.9%	75.8%
Middle Third	72.0%	66.1%
Most Disadvantaged Third	54.9%	52.7%

MATH PROFICIENCY BY PERCENT OF STUDENTS LIVING IN SINGLE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS		
District Ranking	Use EDM	Do Not Use EDM
Least Single Parent Households	79.0%	75.3%
Middle Third	75.4%	67.4%
Most Single Parent Households	56.5%	52.7%

MATH PROFICIENCY BY PERCENT OF STUDENTS ONE+ PARENT HOLDS BACHELOR'S DEGREE OR HIGHER		
District Ranking	Use EDM	Do Not Use EDM
Highest Level Parent Education	81.7%	66.5%
Middle Third	66.5%	67.5%
Lowest Level Parent Education	57.6%	55.4%

MATH PROFICIENCY BY PERCENT OF NON-ASIAN MINORITY STUDENTS IN DISTRICT		
District Ranking	Use EDM	Do Not Use EDM
Fewest Minority Students	80.3%	73.3%
Middle Third	76.4%	65.2%
Most Minority Students	59.5%	52.9%

PERCENT DIFFERENCE IN MATH PROFICIENCY BETWEEN WHITE AND AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS		
Category	Districts Using EDM	Districts Not Using EDM
All Districts	31.4%	33.3%
Percent Economically Disadvantaged		
Least Disadvantaged	31.9%	47.7%
Middle Third	30.8%	35.7%
Most Disadvantaged	26.1%	26.6%
Percent Single Parent Households		
Fewest Sing Parents	35.5%	40.15%
Middle Third	33.4%	44.3%
Most Single Parents	22.7%	23.0%
Percent Households with Parent Holding Bachelor's Degree		
Highest Education	37.9%	40.6%
Middle Third	28.1%	36.5%
Least Education	21.7%	31.2%
Percent of District Belonging to Non-Asian Minorities		
Fewest Minorities	42.0%	49.9%
Middle Third	29.2%	29.1%
Most Minorities	24.1%	25.0%