Math Curriculum Quality & Effectiveness Evaluator

Beta

A tool for educators that synthesizes evidence on instructional materials quality (EdReports) and curriculum effectiveness (Evidence for ESSA) to support evidence-informed curriculum selection.

Disclaimer: This is a beta AI tool and automated searches may be prone to error. Verify findings using the source URLs provided.

Evaluation Results: Curriculum Associates - i-Ready Classroom Mathematics (2024)

Overall Summary

i-Ready Classroom Mathematics (2024) for grades K-8 has been evaluated by EdReports and meets expectations for all three gateways (Focus & Coherence, Rigor & Mathematical Practices, and Usability), indicating adequate alignment, coherence, and usability of the instructional materials. One ESSA-evaluated, vendor-published study shows moderate evidence of effectiveness (Tier 2). The Tier 2 rating reflects a quasi-experimental design using matched comparison groups rather than a randomized controlled trial. Notably, the primary outcome measure was the i-Ready Diagnostic—an assessment developed by the same vendor—rather than independent state summative assessments. The study does not report impacts on state tests. A key open question for districts is whether comparable gains would be observed on independent state assessments.

Part 1: Evidence of High-Quality Instructional Materials (EdReports)

Evaluated by EdReports?	**Yes**
Product Reviewed	**i-Ready Classroom Mathematics (2024)**
Grade Levels Reviewed	**K-8**
Focus & Coherence	**Meets Expectations**
Rigor & Mathematical Practices	**Meets Expectations**
Usability	**Meets Expectations**

View full EdReports review →

Part 2: Evidence of Curriculum Effectiveness

Evaluated by Evidence for ESSA?	**Yes**
Overall ESSA Rating	**Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence**

Understanding ESSA Evidence Tiers

Tier 1 (Strong Evidence): At least one well-designed RCT showing statistically significant positive effects.

Tier 2 (Moderate Evidence): At least one well-designed quasi-experimental study showing statistically significant positive effects.

Tier 3 (Promising Evidence): At least one correlational study with statistical controls showing positive effects.

Tier 4 (Demonstrates a Rationale): Well-defined logic model based on research, with ongoing evaluation efforts.

Research Studies (ESSA-Vetted):

Yo, J., King, G., & Serrano, M. (2025). Achievement and growth for i-Ready Classroom Mathematics in multiple states for grades 3-5 in mathematics. Curriculum Associates.

Design: Quasi-experimental (matched comparison groups) **Peer Reviewed:** No (Vendor-Conducted Research)

Source: Curriculum Associates (Vendor)

Main Findings:

Students in Grades 3-5 attending schools that implemented i-Ready Classroom Mathematics outperformed matched comparison schools on the i-Ready Diagnostic, with an average effect size of +0.10. Subgroup analyses showed positive effects for Hispanic, Black, economically disadvantaged, English learner, and students with disabilities populations. LIMITATIONS: (1) The study was conducted by the curriculum vendor, not independent researchers. (2) The primary outcome was the i-Ready Diagnostic, a curriculum-aligned assessment developed by Curriculum Associates, raising questions about whether effects would transfer to independent measures. (3) The study does not report impacts on state summative assessments. (4) The quasi-experimental design is less rigorous than a randomized controlled trial.

View study →

View Evidence for ESSA report →

Implementation Notes:

No additional staff are required for implementation. The program requires designated points of contact for initial setup, supported by i-Ready Partners. Professional development is available through on-site training (up to 6 hours) and the Online Educator Learning platform. The program is accessed through i-Ready Connect (Windows, MacOS, Chromebook compatible). SSO supported via SAML, Clever, ClassLink, and Google. Available in a hybrid subscription/print model, priced per student.

Part 3: Questions You May Ask the Vendor Based on Evidence

Based on the evidence findings above, consider asking the vendor these questions:

- Your ESSA-rated study (Yo et al., 2025) relies on the i-Ready Diagnostic as the primary outcome. How confident should districts be that observed gains reflect improvements in underlying math proficiency rather than familiarity with the i-Ready assessment ecosystem? What evidence supports transfer beyond curriculum-aligned measures?

- Could you share reports or studies that report associations of i-Ready Classroom Mathematics with third-party interim assessments or state standardized assessments, even if results are mixed? Have you examined within-district correlations between i-Ready Diagnostic growth and growth on state summative tests?

- EdReports reviewed K-8, showing the program meets expectations for alignment, coherence, and usability, but has not reviewed Algebra I or other high school courses. What internal reviews or external validations support alignment for courses beyond grade 8?

- What implementation conditions (dosage, professional development, fidelity thresholds) were present in the Yo et al. study, and what should districts realistically expect if those conditions are not fully replicated?

Appendix: About This Review

How This Tool Works

This review assesses existing evidence of math curriculum quality (alignment, coherence, usability) and effectiveness (evidence that it meaningfully drives student achievement outcomes).

- **Part 1 - Evidence of HQIM:** Searches EdReports to assess whether instructional materials meet High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM) indicators. https://edreports.org/
- **Part 2 - Evidence of Effectiveness:** Searches Evidence for ESSA to evaluate whether rigorous research demonstrates that a curriculum improves student outcomes. https://www.evidenceforessa.org/
- **Together:** Ratings tell us whether a curriculum is well designed (EdReports) and whether there is credible evidence it improves student outcomes (ESSA).

Note: Not finding evidence of effectiveness does not necessarily mean a curriculum is ineffective—it may mean rigorous research hasn't been conducted yet. Newer or smaller programs may lack the resources for large-scale RCTs or quasi-experimental studies. Use these findings as one input among many in your decision-making process.

What This Review Does NOT Assess

This review focuses on curriculum materials and research evidence, but does not provide information on:

- **Evidence-based instructional practices:** The pedagogical strategies and teaching methods that drive rigorous math instruction.
- **Local context fit:** Whether the curriculum aligns with your specific student population, community needs, and district goals.

For evidence-based findings on effective math instruction practices, visit the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Math page: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Math/

How to Use This Evidence in Your Decision-Making

Research evidence is one important input, but curriculum selection should also consider local context. Consider these questions:

- Does this curriculum align with your district's instructional vision?
- What do teachers report about usability and student engagement?
- Does it meet your students' specific needs (ELL support, accessibility)?
- What implementation support does the vendor provide?
- What is the total cost of ownership?