American Instructional Resources Surveys

2022 Technical Documentation and Survey Results

SY DOAN, JOSHUA EAGAN, DAVID GRANT, JULIA H. KAUFMAN, CLAUDE MESSAN SETODJI

Sponsored by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Philanthropies, and the Walton Family Foundation

RAND CORPORATION

RAND AMERICAN EDUCATOR PANELS

For more information on this publication, visit **www.rand.org/t/RRA134-14**.

Published by the RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif.

About This Report

This technical report provides detailed information about the sample, survey instruments, and resultant data for the 2022 American Instructional Resources Surveys (AIRS) that were administered to principals and teachers in spring 2022 via the RAND Corporation's American Educator Panels (AEP).

The 2022 AIRS focused on the usage of, perceptions of, and supports for instructional materials used in English language arts, mathematics, and science kindergarten through grade 12 (K–12) classrooms and social studies kindergarten through grade 5 (K–5) classrooms across the United States. The results are intended to inform policy and education practice related to the use of instructional resources. If you are interested in using AEP data for your own analysis or reading other AEP-related publications, please visit www.rand.org/aep or email aep@rand.org.

RAND Education and Labor

This study was undertaken by RAND Education and Labor, a division of the RAND Corporation that conducts research on early childhood through postsecondary education programs, workforce development, and programs and policies affecting workers, entrepreneurship, and financial literacy and decisionmaking.

This technical report is based on research funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Philanthropies, and the Walton Family Foundation. The findings and conclusions we present are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the foundations funding this technical report. For more information and research on these and other related topics, please visit gatesfoundation.org.

More information about RAND can be found at www.rand.org. Questions about this technical report or about the AIRS project should be directed to jkaufman@rand.org, and questions about RAND Education and Labor should be directed to educationandlabor@rand.org.

This document contains substantial recycled text from the AIRS 2021 Technical Documentation and Survey Results, with the descriptions of the AIRS content, survey administration, and weighting largely identical to Doan et al., 2021.

Acknowledgments

We thank Alvin Nugroho and Casey Hunter for serving, respectively, as the survey manager and data manager for this survey, as well as Tim Colvin for programming the survey. Thanks to Claude Messan Setodji for producing the sampling and weighting for these analyses. We also greatly appreciate the administrative support provided by Tina Petrossian.

Contents

Tables

Chapter 1. American Instructional Resources Surveys: 2022 Technical Documentation

The RAND American Educator Panels (AEP) consist of the American Teacher Panel (ATP), the American School Leader Panel (ASLP), and the American School District Panel (ASDP). These panels are nationally representative samples of kindergarten through grade 12 (K–12) public school educators and leaders. The ATP includes more than 25,000 teachers, the ASLP includes more than 8,000 school principals, and the ASDP includes over 1,000 district leaders (i.e., superintendents). Panelists respond to numerous online survey requests each year. The AEP began in 2014 and expanded significantly during the 2016–2017 and 2017–2018 school years (Robbins and Grant, 2020).

Since 2014, the RAND Corporation has recruited AEP members using probabilistic sampling methods. The AEP samples are designed to be of sufficient size to facilitate national analyses and analyses of prevalent subgroups at the national level (e.g., elementary school teachers, high school mathematics teachers, teachers in urban schools). Similarly, the ATP is designed to permit state-representative analyses of responses among teachers in over 25 states and the District of Columbia.

The 2022 American Instructional Resources Surveys

Currently, little is known about how U.S. teachers use and modify instructional materials in their classrooms to support student needs, leaving policymakers, researchers, and practitioners with limited information on how materials actually are implemented by teachers in their classrooms. In response, RAND researchers administered the American Instructional Resources Surveys (AIRS) to a sample of ATP and ASLP members who worked in K–12 schools in spring 2019, spring 2020, and spring 2021 to learn more about the use of instructional materials, teachers' perceptions of these materials, and the availability of supports (e.g., professional learning) for these materials in classrooms and schools (Kaufman, Doan, et al., 2020). Findings across these surveys provided insight into the following topics:

- what instructional materials are being used by teachers in English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science classrooms
- how teachers are using those materials and how they perceive the materials are supporting students
- what materials teachers are using to support anti-bias education
- what resources are provided to teachers to give them the knowledge and support they need to use their instructional materials in ways that support student learning (see Table 1.1 for details about survey content areas).

In spring 2022, RAND researchers again administered the AIRS to a sample of ATP and ASLP members to provide additional insight into these topics and explore several new topic areas. This 2022 survey is the first of the AIRS surveys to collect educator responses on instructional material use for social studies: It asks elementary ATP respondents and all ASLP respondents to answer survey items related to social studies instructional material use. AIRS ASLP respondents are not asked to answer survey items related to science instructional material use in the 2022 AIRS. The updated surveys also included some minor revisions to some AIRS survey items from prior years, using feedback from reviewers and users of AIRS data.

The AIRS ATP sample targeted two groups of teachers—one classified by geography and one classified by grade level taught. Geographically, the sampling was designed to result in 400 completed surveys in each of 16 states (Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, and Washington) and 1,500 completed surveys across the balance of states for a national total of 7,900 surveys (see the "Survey Completion Results" section for details about completion rates).[1] These sampling targets were selected to balance estimate precision, available sample, and ATP recruitment costs.

The survey targeted K–12 teachers who reported teaching ELA, mathematics, or natural sciences. Among invited teachers, 854 teachers were screened out during the survey process: They were not working as teachers in the grades and subjects asked about in the AIRS and were removed from the invited samples. No screen-ins (e.g., teachers initially classified as fine arts teachers who had switched to natural science during the time of survey administration) were possible because these teachers would not have been invited to complete the survey on the basis of their initial classification. As a result, some level of undercoverage might exist with eligible teachers misclassified as out of scope.

The ASLP sample targeted principals serving in schools at all grade levels. Our goal was 1,500 completed surveys from a national sample of school leaders. Survey eligibility was limited to existing school leaders; we screened out 75 sampled panelists who were not working as school principals. Again, no screen-ins (e.g., a respondent who was classified as a classroom teacher in the sampling frame but became a principal during the time of survey administration) were possible.

Survey Administration and Content

We developed and modified the AIRS surveys in consultation with funders (see the "About This Report" section) and a variety of experts on state standards and curricula. Experts and funders provided feedback on question wording, format, and sequencing, with RAND

[1] Oversampled states include states participating in the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) High Quality Instructional Materials and Professional Development (IMPD) Network and other states (California, Florida, New York) of funder interest.

maintaining final editorial control of the survey items. The surveys were designed to generate representative data on teacher and principal perspectives regarding the topics listed in Table 1.1. Many survey items were developed by RAND, but the surveys also borrowed items (with permission) from several other sources. Our data tables include notes on items taken or adapted from non-RAND sources.[2] In addition, items were borrowed or adapted from prior RAND surveys (Doss and Johnston, 2018; Kaufman et al., 2018).

The data generated from the surveys are intended to be used by researchers and state education agencies in the 16 states where we have teacher oversamples. State education agencies in these 16 states can compare the responses of teachers from their states with a nationally representative comparison group. States have used the AIRS and other AEP data to inform policies on curriculum and instruction and support their curriculum reform efforts.[3]

The AIRS ATP survey had an approximate administration time of 30 minutes. Respondents were assigned to sections based on their responses to questions at the beginning of the survey about their grade band (K–5, 6–8, or 9–12) and subject(s) taught (ELA, mathematics, or natural science). To ensure an adequate number of grade 6–8 teachers in the AIRS ATP sample, if a respondent indicated teaching any grade 6–8, they were assigned the 6–8 grade path. If a respondent indicated teaching any grade K–5 and 9–12 but not 6–8, they were randomly assigned to either the K–5 or 9–12 grade path. Similarly, AIRS ASLP sample members were assigned to the grade 6–8 path if they indicated leading a school serving any grade 6–8 and were randomly assigned to the K–5 or 9–12 grade path if they indicated leading a school serving any grade K–5 and 9–12, but not 6–8.

In 2022, a randomly selected proportion of ATP respondents who indicated that they taught elementary grades and both natural science and social studies—and who would have been assigned to only the natural science path in previous AIRS surveys—were also asked to answer items related to their use and perceptions of social studies instructional materials; the number of items related to use and perceptions of science instructional materials was reduced to compensate for additional time needed for respondents to answer items related to social studies. We rely on the fact that most elementary teachers teach self-contained, multi-subject classrooms, allowing us to administer items related to social studies instruction without needing to expand the panel. Thus, through the ATP, we have information about social studies materials use only for K–5 teachers.

The AIRS ASLP survey had an approximate administration time of 30 minutes. All AIRS ASLP respondents across K–12 schools were asked to respond to items related to social studies instructional materials; only AIRS ATP respondents in grades K–5 were asked to respond to

[2] Non-RAND sources included Achieve the Core, undated; Elmore, Forman, and Stosich, 2016; Shanahan and Duffett, 2013; TNTP, 2018; and University of Chicago, 2017.

[3] See Council of Chief State School Officers, 2020, p. 14.

items related to social studies instructional materials. Readers and analysts interested in the use of social studies materials across all K–12 grades should reference the AIRS ASLP.

Table 1.1 presents a summary of the content areas that were included in each survey.

Table 1.1. American Teacher Panel and American School Leader Panel Survey Content Areas

Content Area	Asked in ATP	Asked in ASLP
Your teaching/school assignment	X	X
General questions about your instruction/school this year	X	X
ELA instructional materials	X	X
Mathematics instructional materials	X	X
Science instructional materials	X	
Social studies instructional materials	X (elementary teachers only)	X
Supports for and perceptions of instructional materials	X	X
Classroom practices	X	
Anti-bias instruction	X	
Professional learning	X	X
Benchmark assessments	X	X
Teacher preparation programs	X	
School culture (learning environment)		X
Respondent and school demographics	X	X

NOTE: Similar items for each topic were asked in spring 2019, spring 2020, and spring 2021 to facilitate longitudinal comparisons. A notable exception is that items about anti-bias instruction are new on the spring 2022 survey.

Survey Completion Results

The 2022 AIRS ATP yielded 7,740 completed responses and 940 partial responses. After review, 323 of the partially completed responses filled out more than 10 percent of the survey and were weighted as part of the final data file (n = 8,063). After removing screened cases from the 15,136 invitations for teachers, the final completion rate, following conventions defined by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), was 56.5 percent (AAPOR response rate 6).[4] Among school leaders, 1,517 fully completed and 279 partially completed the survey. Following review, 81 partially completed surveys were weighted and included in the final data file (n = 1,598). After removal of screened cases, with 5,000 invitations emailed for school leaders, the completion rate was 39.7 percent. Tables 1.2a and 1.2b provide weighted descriptive statistics for ATP and ASLP survey respondents, respectively. The weights, which

[4] *AAPOR Response Rate 6* is defined as (Complete + Partial) / (Complete + Partial + refusal and breakoff + non-contact + Other) (AAPOR, *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*, 9th edition, 2016).

are described in the following paragraphs, are intended to ensure that the sample reflects the national population of teachers and school leaders.

Table 1.2a. Descriptive Statistics for American Teacher Panel Survey Respondents (*n* = 7,740)

Variable	Unweighted Percentage	Weighted Percentage	National Population Percentage
Years of experience			
Ten or more	61.7 [60.7, 62.8]	62.1 [61.0, 63.2]	62.0
Less than ten	38.3 [37.2, 39.3]	37.9 [36.9, 39.0]	38.0
School level			
Elementary	48.9 [47.8, 50.0]	55.1 [54.0, 56.2]	55.1
Middle	20.3 [19.5, 21.2]	17.9 [17.0, 18.7]	17.8
High	30.8 [29.8, 31.8]	27.1 [26.1, 28.1]	27.1
Percentage FRPL			
0–50 percent	51.0 [49.9, 52.1]	50.0 [49.0, 51.1]	49.9
50–100 percent	49.0 [47.9, 50.1]	50.0 [48.9, 51.1]	50.1
Percentage minority			
0–50 percent	51.8 [50.8, 52.9]	48.8 [47.7, 49.9]	48.7
50–100 percent	48.2 [47.1, 49.3]	51.2 [50.1, 52.3]	51.3
School size			
Large	68.3 [67.3, 69.3]	68.0 [67.0, 69.0]	68.1
Small	31.7 [30.7, 32.8]	32.0 [31.0, 33.0]	31.9
School locale			
Suburban	35.7 [34.7, 36.8]	37.9 [36.9, 39.0]	37.8
Town/rural	36.8 [35.7, 37.9]	32.9 [31.9, 33.9]	32.8
Urban	27.5 [26.5, 28.5]	29.2 [28.2, 30.2]	29.4
Gender			
Female	82.1 [81.2, 83.0]	81.0 [80.1, 81.8]	80.9
Male	17.9 [17.1, 18.8]	19.1 [18.2, 19.9]	19.1
Race			
Black	6.8 [6.2, 7.3]	6.8 [6.2, 7.3]	6.8
Hispanic	5.7 [5.2, 6.2]	9.4 [8.7, 10.0]	9.5
Other	4.7 [4.3, 5.2]	4.7 [4.2, 5.2]	4.7
White	82.8 [82.0, 83.6]	79.2 [78.3, 80.1]	78.9

NOTE: FRPL = free or reduced-price lunch. This table contains unweighted and survey-weighted estimates on key descriptive characteristics for the 2022 AIRS ATP sample (*n* = 7,740), in addition to national population estimates for those same characteristics. Ninety-five percent confidence intervals are presented in the brackets. National population estimates were drawn from the 2017–2018 National Teacher and Principal Survey and the 2020–2021 National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD). *Small schools* were defined as having 450 students or less and large schools had more than 450 students. School levels are defined according to NCES CCD definitions and account for the total grade span served by a respondent's school.

Table 1.2b. Descriptive Statistics for American School Leader Panel Survey Respondents (*n* = 1,598)

Variable	Unweighted Percentage	Weighted Percentage	National Population Percentage
Degree			
Bachelor's degree or lower	75.3 [73.2, 77.4]	64.2 [61.8, 66.5]	63.8
Master's degree or higher	24.7 [22.6, 26.8]	35.8 [33.5, 38.2]	36.2
School level			
Elementary	62.2 [59.8, 64.6]	59.2 [56.8, 61.6]	59.0
Middle	19.0 [17.1, 21.0]	18.4 [16.5, 20.3]	18.3
High	18.8 [16.9, 20.7]	22.4 [20.4, 24.5]	22.8
Percent FRPL			
0–50 percent	50.4 [47.9, 52.8]	49.2 [46.8, 51.7]	49.0
50–100 percent	49.6 [47.2, 52.1]	50.8 [48.3, 53.2]	51.0
Percent minority			
0–50 percent	54.5 [52.1, 57.0]	53.7 [51.2, 56.1]	53.4
50–100 percent	45.5 [43.1, 47.9]	46.4 [43.9, 48.8]	46.6
School size			
Large	53.0 [50.6, 55.5]	48.5 [46.0, 50.9]	48.7
Small	47.0 [44.5, 49.5]	51.5 [49.1, 54.0]	51.3
School locale			
Suburban	29.9 [27.6, 32.1]	31.5 [29.2, 33.8]	31.7
Town/rural	42.4 [39.9, 44.8]	41.6 [39.2, 44.0]	41.5
Urban	27.8 [25.6, 30.0]	26.9 [24.8, 29.1]	26.8
Gender			
Female	50.7 [48.2, 53.1]	53.2 [50.8, 55.7]	53.3
Male	49.3 [46.9, 51.8]	46.8 [44.3, 49.2]	46.8
Race			
Other	21.6 [19.6, 23.6]	21.7 [19.6, 23.7]	21.7
White	78.4 [76.4, 80.4]	78.3 [76.3, 80.4]	78.3

NOTE: This table contains unweighted and survey weighted estimates on key descriptive characteristics for the 2022 AIRS ASLP sample (*n* = 1,598), in addition to national population estimates for those same characteristics. Ninety-five percent confidence intervals are presented in brackets. National population estimates were drawn from the 2017–2018 National Teacher and Principal Survey and the 2020–2021 NCES CCD. *Small schools* were defined as having 450 students or less and large schools had more than 450 students. School levels are defined according to NCES CCD definitions and account for the total grade span served by a respondent's school. This table was updated in July 2024 with corrected data.

Calibrated Weighting

The 2022 AIRS includes weights to produce estimates that reflect the national population of public school teachers and principals in the United States and state-specific populations in 16 oversampled states during the 2021–2022 school year. The weighting process accounts for the probability of selection into the survey from the panel and the likelihood that an invited teacher or principal will complete the survey. These likelihoods are calibrated to reproduce the population distribution of K–12 teachers and principals, with state-specific calibrations performed in oversampled states. The nonresponse adjustment is important to eliminate known sources of bias and ensure that the weighted sample matches the national characteristics of educators at the individual and school levels. This weighting approach is widely used for probability sample surveys and to adjust for nonresponse, including for such U.S. Department of Education surveys as the Teacher Follow-Up Survey. The final analysis weights are the product of the following three interim weights:

1. **The calibrated weight of the ATP/ASLP sampling frame.** This is a calibration weight that assigns a weight for each ATP/ASLP member based on individual- and school-level characteristics so that the sum of the weights along the calibration factors closely matches the characteristics of the national population of teachers and principals based on the Schools and Staffing Survey and the CCD, which are both from the NCES, as well as the state-specific population of teachers and principals in oversampled states. (See Robbins and Grant, 2020, for more information.)
2. **The sample selection weight.** This is the inverse probability of selection into the 2022 AIRS sample using the ATP/ASLP as the frame. These probabilities were selected to achieve the goals of 7,900 ATP and 1,500 ASLP completed surveys. These weights are used to account for the differential probability that respondents are invited and enrolled in the ATP/ASLP**.**
3. **The survey response weight.** This is the inverse of the modeled probability of a teacher or principal completing the survey. These weights are used to account for the differential probability that respondents complete the 2022 AIRS, conditional on being invited to complete the 2022 AIRS.

We subsequently recalibrated and trimmed the products of these weights as necessary. Recalibration ensures that the weights recover the population estimates after selection and nonresponse adjustments are applied. The sampling and weighting approach was designed to ensure a representative sample and limit the size of the design effect. We calculated the sampling frame weights to make the panel match the national population of teachers and principals based on several school-level (e.g., school size, level, urbanicity, sociodemographics) and individual-level (e.g., gender, experience) characteristics. The inverse of the selection probabilities (p_{si}) was used as the sample selection weight. We estimated the response weights by modeling the likelihood (p_{ri}) that a selected participant would respond to the survey, conditional on the school-level and individual-level characteristics of teachers and principals (including the states in which they are working). For parsimony, we used a variable-selection method to choose the model that

best fit the data. We estimated the main weight as the product of the sampling frame calibration weight ($1/p_{fi}$), the sample selection weight ($1/p_{si}$), and the response weight ($1/p_{ri}$), as follows:

$$Main\ Weight = {}^{1}/_{p_{fi}} \times {}^{1}/_{p_{si}} \times {}^{1}/_{p_{ri}}.$$

Because there is no guarantee that this main weight sums up to the total of all the population characteristics, it was calibrated again using individual and school-level characteristics to obtain the final weight. If some of these final weights were extreme within sampling states, a trimming process (at the 95th percentile) was used to reduce the outliers, and the trimmed weights were reallocated for the population totals to remain the same after trimming.[5]

The survey weights included in the 2022 AIRS, as with survey weights produced for each of the previous AIRS surveys, are intended to facilitate cross-sectional (e.g., current-year) analysis of teacher and school leader responses to the surveys. Cross-sectional comparisons of estimates across the 2019, 2020, 2021, and 2022 AIRS are useful for observing shifts in national, descriptive trends, but these weights were not designed to conduct longitudinal analyses among the same teachers over time (i.e., they do not account for panel members who do and do not complete the AIRS in multiple years).

[5] Replicate weights were not produced for the AIRS data files; variance estimation using the provided single weight should suffice. We made this decision after calculating variance with and without replication, and we determined that differences in the standard errors were negligible. If analysts of these data need to estimate variance using replication, syntax for an alternative variance estimation method (jackknife) is available on request.

Chapter 2. American Instructional Resources Surveys: Teacher Survey Results

Your Teaching Assignment

Table 2.1. This School Year (2021–2022), What Grade(s) Do You Teach? (*n* = 8,063)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Kindergarten	12
Grade 1	14
Grade 2	13
Grade 3	14
Grade 4	13
Grade 5	12
Grade 6	11
Grade 7	11
Grade 8	12
Grade 9	16
Grade 10	18
Grade 11	18
Grade 12	19
Ungraded (including special education students aged 18–22)	1
Other	1

NOTE: Respondents were instructed to select all that apply. Percentages will not sum to 100 percent.

Table 2.2. Please Indicate All Subjects You Teach as Part of Your Regular Teaching Assignment This School Year (2021–2022) (*n* = 8,063)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Special education	11
Arts and music	4
English and language arts (including English, language arts, reading, literature, etc.)	71
English as a second language (ESL)	11
Foreign languages	1
Health education	7
Mathematics (including general mathematics, algebra, geometry, calculus, etc.)	61
Computer science	5
Natural sciences (including general science, biology, chemistry, physics, etc.)	47
Social sciences (including social studies, geography, history, government/civics, etc.)	41
Career or technical education	1
Other subject	4

NOTE: Respondents were instructed to select all that apply. Percentages will not sum to 100 percent.

Table 2.3. This School Year (2021–2022), in What Subject Is Your Main Teaching Assignment, That Is, the Subject Matter in Which You Teach the Most Classes? (*n* = 8,063)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Elementary education	44
Special education	5
Arts and music	0
English and language arts (including English, language arts, reading, literature, writing, speech, etc.)	23
English as a Second Language (ESL)	1
Health education	0
Mathematics (including general mathematics, algebra, geometry, calculus, etc.)	15
Natural sciences (including general science, biology, chemistry, physics, etc.)	10
Social sciences (including social studies, geography, history, government/civics, etc.)	1
Career or technical education	0
Computer science	0
Other	1

General Questions About Your Instruction

Table 2.4. Through the End of March 2022, Approximately How Many Weeks This School Year (2021–2022) Were at Least Some In-Person Classes Suspended or Held Remotely for Your Students Because of the COVID-19 Pandemic? (*n* = 7,826)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Zero weeks	69
1–4 weeks	16
5–9 weeks	2
10–29 weeks	4
30–51 weeks	7
52 weeks	2

NOTE: COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019.

Table 2.5. Approximately What Percentage of Your Students Have Completed All or Almost All of Your Assignments so Far This School Year (2021–2922)? (*n* = 8,058)

Category	Weighted Percentage
0–25 percent	5
26–50 percent	8
51–75 percent	22
76–100 percent	65

Table 2.6. In a Typical Week This School Year (2021–2022), Approximately How Many Hours Have You Spent on Instructional Planning—Including Finding Materials and Creating Lesson Plans on Your Own or with Others—for the Following Subjects You Teach? (*n* = 8,023)

	Weighted Percentage					
Category	**0–1 hours**	**2–3 hours**	**4–5 hours**	**6–7 hours**	**8–9 hours**	**10 or more hours**
Special education	22	28	25	5	2	18
Arts and music	74	18	5	1	0	2
English and language arts	15	31	24	7	4	19
ESL	51	26	16	1	1	4
Foreign languages	41	23	11	6	4	16
Health education	89	6	3	0	0	1
Mathematics	22	32	22	6	3	15
Natural sciences	46	24	13	4	2	12
Social sciences	59	24	11	2	1	3
Career or technical education	36	14	22	3	6	19
Computer science	72	11	11	2	1	2
Other subject	37	28	18	2	2	13

Table 2.7. Approximately How Many Hours of Learning Activities Is a Typical Student Expected to Undertake During a Typical Week of the 2021–2022 School Year for the Following Subjects You Teach? (*n* = 8,019)

	Weighted Percentage					
Category	**0–1 hours**	**2–3 hours**	**4–5 hours**	**6–7 hours**	**8–9 hours**	**10 or more hours**
Special education	21	20	29	6	2	22
Arts and music	56	30	10	1	0	3
English and language arts	3	12	26	18	6	35
ESL	30	29	27	4	2	8
Foreign languages	6	22	56	2	0	14
Health education	68	22	8	0	0	1
Mathematics	6	10	39	25	7	14
Natural sciences	22	38	32	3	1	4
Social sciences	30	41	24	2	0	2
Career or technical education	35	18	29	6	5	6
Computer science	51	30	14	1	3	0
Other subject:	21	35	34	3	1	5

Table 2.8. Have You Ever Used EdReports to Select, Modify, or Implement Curriculum? (*n* = 8,045)

Category	**Weighted Percentage**
No	92
Yes	8

Table 2.9. Do You Use Open Educational Resources (OERs) for Your Classroom Instruction? (*n* = 8,043)

Category	**Weighted Percentage**
No	59
Yes	22
I don’t know	19

Table 2.10a. Among the ELA Curriculum Materials in This List, Select: (1) Any Materials You Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for your ELA Instruction This School Year (2021–2022); (2) Any Materials Provided by Your School or School District This School Year (2021–2022), Either as a Requirement or Recommendation Whether You Use Them or Not (Elementary School ELA Curriculum, *n* = 1,573)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage, Required or Recommended
Curriculum materials I create myself	45	5
Curriculum materials my school or district created	25	18
Other curriculum materials not listed (please specify)	23	15
Lucy Calkins Unit of Study (Heinemann or Columbia)	18	18
The Fountas & Pinnell Classroom (Heinemann)	16	17
Benchmark Advance or Literacy (Benchmark Education)	13	17
Fundations (Wilson Language Training)	12	14
Engage NY (New York State Education Department)	9	9
Reading Wonders—2020 (McGraw-Hill Education)	9	10
Journeys (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	8	8
Reading Wonders 2017 (McGraw-Hill Education)	8	8
CommonLit (CommonLit)	6	3
Ready Reading (Curriculum Associates)	5	5
Wilson Fundations (Wilson Language Training Corporation)	5	6
Core Knowledge Language Arts (CKLA) (Amplify)	5	5
EL Education or Expeditionary Learning Imagine Learning	4	5
Into Reading 2020 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4	6
N/A—I do not use a particular curriculum materials regularly or my district and/or school do not provide any curriculum materials to me	3	4
English Language Arts Guidebook Units (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	3	5
MyView Literacy (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	3	5
Wit & Wisdom (Great Minds)	3	4
ReadyGEN (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	3	5
Saxon Phonics and Spelling (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3	3
Collaborative Literacy (Center for Collaborative Classroom)	3	5
Reading Street Common Core (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	3	4
ARC Core (American Reading Company)	2	3
Treasures (Macmillan/McGraw-Hill)	2	2
CKLA (Amplify)—Open Access Version	2	3
Reach for Reading (National Geographic Learning, Cengage)	2	2
Bookworms (Comprehensive Reading Solutions or Open Up Resources)	2	3
English Language Arts Guidebook Units—Louisiana Version (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	1	3
Calvert Learning (Edmentum, formerly Calvert)	1	2
Fishtank Plus (Fishtank Learning)	1	2

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that (1) they regularly use a material at least once a week and (2) a material is required or recommended to them by their school or district. Respondents who were assigned to the elementary school grade level path and ELA subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.10b. Among the ELA Curriculum Materials in This List, Select: (1) Any Materials You Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Your ELA Instruction This School Year (2021–2022), and (2) Any Materials Provided by Your School or School District This School Year (2021–2022), Either as a Requirement or Recommendation Whether You Use Them or Not (Middle School ELA Curriculum, *n* = 885)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended
Curriculum materials I create myself	57	10
Curriculum materials my school or district created	34	22
CommonLit (CommonLit)	26	13
Other curriculum materials not listed (please specify)	23	14
Engage NY (New York State Education Department [NYSED])	11	5
Lucy Calkins Unit of Study (Heinemann or Columbia)	10	15
N/A—I do not use a particular curriculum materials regularly or my district and/or school do not provide any curriculum materials to me	8	9
Amplify ELA (Amplify)	7	9
StudySync (McGraw-Hill Education)	6	8
Holt McDougal Literature (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	6	6
MyPerspectives—2017 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	6	10
Edgenuity (Imagine Learning, formerly Edgenuity)	5	8
English Language Arts Guidebook Units (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	4	3
Into Literature (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4	5
Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes (Prentice Hall)	4	4
Collections—2017 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4	4
Benchmark Advance or Literacy (Benchmark Education)	3	7
Collections—2015 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3	3
EL Education or Expeditionary Learning Imagine Learning	3	5
Reading Wonders—2017 (McGraw-Hill Education)	2	4
Journeys (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	2	5
Reading Wonders—2020 (McGraw-Hill Education)	2	3
SpringBoard—2021 (College Board)	2	3
Ready Reading (Curriculum Associates)	2	3
ARC Core (American Reading Company)	1	3
SpringBoard ELA Common Core Edition—2018 (College Board)	1	3
Wit and Wisdom (Great Minds)	1	3
English Language Arts Guidebook Units – Louisiana Version (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	1	2
Code X (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, Scholastic)	1	2
Mirrors and Windows (Carnegie Learning, formerly EMC Publishing Company)	1	1
ReadyGEN (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	1	2
Into Reading—2020 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	1	3
Fishtank Plus (Fishtank Learning)	1	1
Reach for Reading (National Geographic Learning, Cengage Learning)	1	2
Paths to College and Career (John Wiley and Sons)	0	2

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended
Developing Core Literacy Proficiencies (Odell Education)	0	2
Spider Learning ELA (Spider Learning, Inc.)	0	2

NOTE: Table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that (1) they regularly use a material at least once a week and (2) a material is required or recommended to them by their school or district. Respondents who were assigned to the middle school grade level path and ELA subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.10c. Among the ELA Curriculum Materials in This List, Select: (1) Any Materials You Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Your ELA Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (2) Any Materials Provided by Your School or School District This School Year (2021–2022), Either as a Requirement or Recommendation Whether You Use Them or Not (High School ELA Curriculum, *n* = 1,242)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended
Curriculum materials I create myself	75	14
Curriculum materials my school or district created	33	26
CommonLit (CommonLit)	24	10
Other curriculum materials not listed (please specify)	17	9
Holt McDougal Literature (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	9	9
MyPerspectives—2017 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	8	13
N/A—I do not use a particular curriculum materials regularly or my district and/or school do not provide any curriculum materials to me	8	14
StudySync (McGraw-Hill Education)	6	8
Engage NY (NYSED)	5	3
Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes (Prentice Hall)	5	4
Edgenuity (Imagine Learning, formerly Edgenuity)	5	12
Pearson Literature—2015 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	5	6
Collections—2017 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	5	7
SpringBoard—2021 (College Board)	4	7
SpringBoard ELA Common Core Edition—2018 (College Board)	4	6
Into Literature (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3	4
Collections—2015 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	2	4
English Language Arts Guidebook Units (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	2	2
Fishtank Plus (Fishtank Learning)	1	1
Mirrors and Windows: Connecting with Literature (Carnegie Learning, formerly EMC Publishing Company)	1	2
English Language Arts Guidebook Units–Louisiana Version (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	1	2
Paths to College and Career (John Wiley and Sons)	0	1
ARC Core (American Reading Company)	0	1
Odell Education High School Literacy Program–2020 (Odell Education)	0	1
Developing Core Literacy Proficiencies (Odell Education)	0	1

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who (1) indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week and (2) indicated that a material is required or recommended to them by their school or district. Respondents who were assigned to the high school grade level path and ELA subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.11. Indicate Which Additional Instructional Materials—Beyond Curriculum Materials—You or Your Students Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for ELA Instruction This School Year (*n* = 3,637)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using
Resources I create myself	55
Teachers Pay Teachers	50
YouTube	45
Resources I create collectively with other teachers at my school	35
Kahoot!	34
Using a search engine (e.g., Google)	30
Epic!	27
BrainPOP	27
Resources obtained through social media sites	22
Newsela	21
i-Ready	18
Quizlet	16
ReadWorks	15
Scholastic News	14
Flipgrid	14
Quizizz	13
RAZ Kids	13
ixl.com	13
Blooket	13
Khan Academy	13
Nearpod	13
Flocabulary	13
EdPuzzle	12
Accelerated Reader (Renaissance)	10
ABCya!	10
Starfall	9
ReadWriteThink	8
Other (please specify)	8
NoRedInk	8
PearDeck	8
Lexia (Rosetta Stone)	7
Seesaw	7
Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) (Fountas and Pinnell)	6
Common Core State Standards Initiative (corestandards.org)	6
Freckle	5
Edutopia	5
State department of education website	4
MobyMax	4
Achieve 3000	4
Storyworks (Scholastic)	4
Istation	4
mClass (Amplify Education, Inc.)	3
Quill	3
Study Island (Edmuntum)	3
TIME for Kids	3

Name	Weighted Percentage Using
Read 180 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3
A leveled literacy intervention program not listed above (please specify)	2
LearnZillion	2
Wilson Reading System	2
Read Theory	2
95 Percent Group	2
Edmodo	2
Reading Plus	2
Achieve the Core	2
BetterLesson	2
SPIRE	2
WonderWorks (McGraw Hill)	1
Common Sense Education	1
Teacher.org	1
Teaching Channel	1
Kiddom	0
N/A—I do not use any other materials regularly	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week. Respondents who were assigned to the ELA subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.12a. Among the Mathematics Curriculum Materials in This List, Select: (1) Any Materials You Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Your Mathematics Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (2) Any Materials Provided by Your School or School District This School Year (2021–2022), Either as a Requirement or Recommendation Whether You Use Them or Not (Elementary School Math Curriculum, *n* = 1,274)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended
Curricula I create myself	28	3
Ready or iReady Classroom Mathematics (Curriculum Associates)	18	19
Other curriculum materials not listed (please specify)	17	11
EngageNY (NYSED)	16	10
Go Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	15	15
Eureka Math (Great Minds)	15	15
Curricula my school or district created	12	8
Zearn (Zearn, Inc.)	11	6
enVision Math—2020 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	9	12
enVision Math 2.0—2016 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	9	13
Bridges In Mathematics (Math Learning Center)	7	8
Common Core Coach (Triumph Learning or School Specialty, Inc.)	5	4
Illustrative Math K–5 (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion, Kendall Hunt)	5	5
My Math—2014 or 2018 (McGraw-Hill Education)	4	5
N/A—I do not use a particular curriculum material regularly or my district and/or school do not provide any curriculum materials to me	4	5
enVision Math—2012 (Pearson)	4	6
Everyday Math 4—2020 (McGraw Hill Education)	4	5
My Math—2020 (McGraw-Hill Education)	4	4
Math Expressions—2018 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4	5
Into Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4	4
Investigations in Number, Data and Space, 3rd Edition—2017 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	4	4
Everyday Math—2016 (McGraw Hill Education)	3	4
Singapore Math (Marshall Cavendish Education Pte Ltd.)	3	2
Connecting Math Concepts (McGraw-Hill Education)	3	4
Math Expressions—2013 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3	3
Big Ideas Math: Modeling Real Life—2019 (Big Ideas Learning, LLC)	2	4
Math in Focus (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	2	3
Saxon Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	2	2
Fishtank Plus (Fishtank Learning)	2	2
Reveal Math, Common Core Edition (McGraw-Hill Education)	1	2

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who (1) indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week and (2) indicated that a material is required or recommended to them by their school or district. Respondents who were assigned to the elementary school grade level path and mathematics subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.12b. Among the Mathematics Curriculum Materials in This List, Select: (1) Any Materials You Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Your Mathematics Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (2) Any Materials Provided by Your School or School District This School Year (2021–2022), Either as a Requirement or Recommendation Whether You Use Them or Not (Middle School Math Curriculum, *n* = 699)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required/ Recommended
Curriculum materials I create myself	53	6
Other curriculum materials not listed (please specify)	27	14
Curriculum materials my school or district created	26	17
Ready or iReady Classroom Mathematics (Curriculum Associates)	16	17
Big Ideas Math (Big Ideas Learning, LLC)	11	11
Illustrative Math (Kendall Hunt) (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion) (McGraw Hill)	11	8
Go Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	11	13
Engage NY (NYSED)	9	7
Glencoe Math (McGraw-Hill Education)	7	6
enVision Math 2.0—2016 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	7	7
Open Up Resources 6–8 Math or Illustrative Math (Open Up Resources)	7	6
N/A—I do not use a particular curriculum material regularly or my district and/or school do not provide any curriculum materials to me	6	7
Holt McDougal Mathematics (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	6	5
Eureka Math (Great Minds)	5	8
Edgenuity (Imagine Learning, formerly Edgenuity)	5	5
enVision Math—2020 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	4	6
Connected Mathematics Project 3 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	4	6
Big Ideas Math—Modeling Real Life—2019 (Big Ideas Learning, LLC)	4	5
Prentice Hall Mathematics (Pearson)	3	2
Carnegie Learning Middle School Math Solution- 2018 (Carnegie Learning)	3	4
Core Connections (CPM Educational Programs)	3	4
Common Core Coach (Triumph Learning or School Specialty, Inc.)	3	2
Carnegie Learning Math Series—2011 (Carnegie Learning)	2	2
Into Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	2	2
Reveal Math, Common Core Edition (McGraw-Hill Education)	2	3
Fishtank Plus (Fishtank Learning)	2	1
Agile Mind Middle School Mathematics (Agile Mind)	1	2
EdGems (EdGems, LLC)	1	1

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who (1) indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week and (2) indicated that a material is required or recommended to them by their school or district. Respondents who were assigned to the middle school grade level path and mathematics subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.12c. Among the Mathematics Curriculum Materials in this List, Select: (1) Any Materials You Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Your Mathematics Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (2) Any Materials Provided by Your School or School District This School Year (2021–2022), Either as a Requirement or Recommendation Whether You Use Them or Not (High School Math Curriculum, *n* = 694)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended
Curriculum materials I create myself	59	12
Curriculum materials my school or district created	30	20
Other curriculum materials not listed (please specify)	23	10
Pearson Traditional (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	10	8
Big Ideas Traditional (Big Ideas Learning, LLC)	10	11
Glencoe Traditional (McGraw-Hill Education)	9	8
I do not use a particular curriculum material regularly or my district and/or school do not provide any curriculum materials to me	9	14
Engage NY (NYSED)	8	5
Big Ideas Integrated (Big Ideas Learning, LLC)	7	7
eMathInstruction Common Core for High School Mathematics (eMath Instruction, Inc.)	5	1
Pearson Integrated (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	5	6
Edgenuity (Imagine Learning, formerly Edgenuity)	5	13
Illustrative Math (Kendall Hunt)	5	5
Core-Plus Mathematics (McGraw-Hill Education)	3	4
Discovering Mathematics: Algebra, Geometry, Advanced Algebra (Kendall Hunt)	3	3
Carnegie Integrated (Carnegie Learning)	3	5
Holt McDougal Larson Traditional Series (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3	2
enVision A/G/A [Algebra I/Geometry/Algebra II] (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	3	8
CPM Integrated Math (CPM Education Program)	3	5
HMH Traditional (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	2	6
SpringBoard Traditional (College Board)	2	2
Carnegie Learning Math Solution Traditional (Carnegie Learning)	2	4
Eureka Math (Great Minds)	2	3
Reveal Math Traditional (McGraw-Hill Education)	2	2
Interactive Mathematics Program (IMP)—Integrated (Activate Learning)	2	1
Open Up High School Mathematics Integrated (Open Up Resources, formerly Mathematics Vision Project)	2	1
enVision Integrated (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	1	4
SpringBoard Integrated (College Board)	1	1
Agile Mind Traditional A/G/A [Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II] (Agile Mind)	1	2
CPM Traditional Math (CPM Education Program)	1	2
Reveal Math Integrated (McGraw-Hill Education)	1	3
Into A/G/A [Algebra I/Geometry/Algebra II] (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	1	1
Open Up High School Mathematics Traditional (Open Up Resources, formerly Mathematics Vision Project)	1	2
HMH Integrated (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	1	4
Agile Mind Integrated Mathematics (Agile Mind)	0	1
Fishtank Math A/G/A [Algebra I/Geometry/Algebra II] (Fishtank Learning)	0	1

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who (1) indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week and (2) indicated that a material is required or recommended to them by their school or district. Respondents who were assigned to the high school grade level path and mathematics subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.13. Indicate Which Additional Instructional Materials – Beyond Curriculum Materials—You or Your Students Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Mathematics Instruction This School Year (*n* = 2,614)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using
Teachers Pay Teachers	46
Resources I create myself	42
YouTube	32
Kahoot!	28
Resources I create collectively with other teachers at my school	27
Khan Academy	23
BrainPOP	22
IXL Math	22
Using a search engine (e.g., Google)	20
Desmos	19
Quizizz	18
Prodigy	18
i-Ready (Curriculum Associates)	18
Resources obtained through social media sites	16
Kuta Software	12
XtraMath	10
ixl.com	9
Quizlet	8
Other	8
Common Core State Standards Initiative (corestandards.org)	7
Zearn	7
DeltaMath	6
Splash Math	6
Dreambox	6
ST Math	6
Freckle	5
Reflex	5
Starfall	5
MobyMax	5
Go Math! Intervention	5
State department of education website	5
enVision MATH: Diagnosis and Intervention System (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	4
Imagine Learning	3
LearnZillion	3
Greg Tang Math	3
N/A—I do not use any other materials regularly to plan my instruction	3

Name	Weighted Percentage Using
Illuminations (NCTM)	3
Scholastic Teacher	2
Istation	2
MathXL for School (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	2
Open Middle	2
Study Island (Edmentum)	2
Bridges Intervention	2
BetterLesson	1
Response to Intervention (RTI) Everyday Intervention (Nasco)	1
Edutopia	1
Achieve the Core	1
SuccessMaker (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	1
Edmodo	1
Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) (McGraw-Hill Education)	1
ck-12	1
Do The Math (Scholastic/Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	1
National Library of Virtual Manipulatives (NLVM)	1
Robert Kaplinsky	1
Common Sense Education	1
Mathematics Assessment Project	1
Teacher.org	1
Teaching Channel	0
Share My Lesson	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week. Respondents who were assigned to the mathematics subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.14a. Among the Science Curriculum Materials in This List, Select: (1) Any Materials You Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Your Science Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (2) Any Materials Provided by Your School or School District This School Year (2021–2022), Either as a Requirement or Recommendation Whether You Use Them or Not (Elementary School Science Curriculum, *n* = 853)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended
Curriculum materials I create myself	47	3
Mystery Science (Mystery Science)	36	20
Curriculum materials my school or district created	22	17
Other Curriculum materials not listed (please specify)	13	9
Generation Genius (National Science Teachers Association)	11	3
FOSS Next Generation K–8 (Delta Education)	8	10
N/A—I do not use a particular curriculum material regularly or my district and/or school do not provide any curriculum materials to me	8	10
STEMscopes (Accelerate Learning, Inc.)	7	10
Amplify Science (Amplify)	7	8
ScienceFusion (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	5	9
Science Studies Weekly (American Legacy Publishing)	5	5
Exploring Science (National Geographic Learning)	5	3
Harcourt Science (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	5	6
Pearson Science (Pearson)	4	5
McGraw-Hill Science (McGraw-Hill Education)	4	6
HMH Science Dimensions (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4	6
Next Generation Science Storylines units (Next Generation Science Storylines)	3	4
Science Techbook (Discovery Education)	3	4
PLTW Launch (Project Lead the Way)	3	6
Elevate Science (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	2	6
Interactive Science (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	2	5
Science and Technology Concepts	2	3
Inspire Science (McGraw-Hill Education)	1	3
PhD Science (Great Minds)	0	2

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who (1) indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week and (2) indicated that a material is required or recommended to them by their school or district. Respondents who were assigned to the elementary school grade level path and science subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.14b. Among the Science Curriculum Materials in This List, Select: (1) Any Materials You Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Your Science Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (2) Any Materials Provided by Your School or School District This School Year (2021–2022), Either as a Requirement or Recommendation Whether You Use Them or Not (Middle School Science Curriculum, *n* = 380)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended
Curriculum materials I create myself	62	12
Curriculum materials my school or district created	28	21
Other curriculum materials not listed (please specify)	18	10
Generation Genius (National Science Teachers Association)	13	5
STEMscopes (Accelerate Learning, Inc.)	10	9
Amplify Science (Amplify)	10	12
Science Techbook (Discovery Education)	9	9
Next Generation Science Storylines units (Next Generation Science Storylines)	8	2
OpenSciEd units (OpenSciEd)	7	6
Pearson Science (Pearson)	7	5
Glencoe Life Science (McGraw-Hill Education)	6	8
N/A—I do not use a particular curriculum material regularly or my district and/or school do not provide any curriculum materials to me	6	12
McGraw-Hill Science (McGraw-Hill Education)	6	5
Prentice Hall Science Explorer (Pearson)	5	2
ScienceFusion (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	5	4
Project-Based Inquiry Science (Activate Learning)	4	3
HMH Science Dimensions (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4	6
Harcourt Science (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4	5
Inspire Science (McGraw-Hill Education)	4	4
iScience (McGraw-Hill Education)	3	2
Holt Science and Technology (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3	3
FOSS Next Generation Middle School (Delta Education)	3	3
Science and Technology Concepts	3	3
Elevate Science (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	3	4
Interactive Science (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	2	4
IQWST (Activate Learning)	2	1
Issues and Science (Lab-Aids)	2	3
PLTW Gateway (Project Lead the Way)	1	5

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who (1) indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week and (2) indicated that a material is required or recommended to them by their school or district. Respondents who were assigned to the middle school grade level path and science subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.14c. Among the Science Curriculum Materials in This List, Select: (1) Any Materials You Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Your Science Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (2) Any Materials Provided by Your School or School District This School Year (2021–2022), Either as a Requirement or Recommendation Whether You Use Them or Not (High School Science Curriculum, *n* = 405)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended
Curriculum materials I create myself	68	11
Curriculum materials my school or district created	27	18
Other curriculum materials not listed (please specify)	26	11
CK–12 Biology, CK–12 Chemistry for High School, or CK–12 Interactive Physics for High School (CK–12)	17	7
N/A—I do not use a particular curriculum material regularly or my district and/or school do not provide any curriculum materials to me	13	25
Miller and Levine Biology (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	10	10
OpenStax (Rice University)	9	3
Inspire Science (McGraw-Hill Education)	7	5
Biology for Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) (BIOZONE)	7	3
Science Techbook (Discovery Education)	6	5
Active Chemistry, Active Physical Science or Active Physics (Activate Learning)	6	2
Next Generation Science Storylines units (Next Generation Science Storylines)	6	4
STEMscopes (Accelerate Learning, Inc.)	5	8
Environmental Science (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	5	5
inquiryHub Biology or Chemistry (University of Colorado—Boulder)	4	3
Earth Science (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	4	4
Issues and Science (Lab-Aids)	3	2
Savvas Chemistry (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	3	3
HMH Science Dimensions Chemistry (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3	4
Model-based Biology (University of California—Davis)	2	2
Earth and Space Sciences (BIOZONE)	2	2
PLTW Engineering or Biomedical Science (Project Lead the Way)	2	7
Science Education for Public Understanding Program (SEPUP) (Lab-Aids)	1	3
Experience Chemistry or Experience Physics (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	1	3
Foundations of Physics (Frey Scientific/CPO Science)	1	1

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended
Science and Global Issues (Lab-Aids)	1	1
Physics: A First Course (Frey Scientific/CPO Science)	1	3
Essential Chemistry or Essential Physics (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	1	3
EarthComm (Activate Learning)	1	1

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who (1) indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week and (2) indicated that a material is required or recommended to them by their school or district. Respondents who were assigned to the high school grade level path and science subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Elementary Social Studies Curriculum

Table 2.15. Among the Elementary Social Studies Curriculum Materials in This List, Select: (1) Any Materials You Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Your Social Studies Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (2) Any Materials Provided by Your School or School District This School Year (2021–2022), Either as a Requirement or Recommendation Whether You Use Them or Not (Elementary School Social Studies Curriculum, *n* = 721)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using	Weighted Percentage Required or Recommended
Curriculum materials I create myself	51	8
Curriculum materials my school or district created	28	26
N/A—I do not use a particular curriculum material regularly or my district and/or school do not provide any curriculum materials to me	18	25
Studies Weekly (Studies Weekly, Inc.)	16	16
Other curriculum materials not listed (please specify)	15	11
MyWorld Interactive (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	7	11
Social Studies Alive! (TCI)	4	5
IMPACT Social Studies (McGraw Hill)	4	6
Into Social Studies (HMH)	3	5
Our World (Five Ponds Press)	1	3
Young Citizens (Social Studies School Service)	1	2
Active Classroom (Social Studies School Service)	0	2
Inquiry Journeys (InquirED)	0	2
Nystrom Atlas (Social Studies School Service)	0	2

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who (1) indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week and (2) indicated that a material is required or recommended to them by their school or district. Respondents who were assigned to the elementary school grade level path and science subject path and indicated that they taught “Social Studies” as part of their regular teaching assignment were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.16. Indicate Which Additional Instructional Materials—Beyond Curriculum Materials—You or Your Students Use Regularly (Once a Week or More, on Average) for Social Studies Instruction This School Year (*n* = 721)

Name	Weighted Percentage Using
Teachers Pay Teachers	70
BrainPOP	60
YouTube	48
Scholastic News	37
Kahoot!	32
Using a search engine (e.g., Google)	31
Seesaw	21
Newsela	17
Resources obtained through social media sites	16
TIME for Kids	15
Khan Academy	12
ixl.com	11
Other	8
Quizlet	8
MobyMax	6
Edutopia	6
State department of education website	5
Smithsonian	4
Common Sense Education	4
CommonLit	3
iCivics	2
National Parks Service Teaching with Historic Places	2
Teaching Tolerance (Learning for Justice)	2
Study Island (Edmentum)	2
The DBQ Project	2
Bill of Rights Institute	1
Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History	1
1619 Project	1
Read.Inquire.Write.	1
Library of Congress Teaching with Primary Sources	1
Native Knowledge 360	0
Share My Lesson	0
Facing History and Ourselves	0
Histories Mysteries	0
National Archives	0
Teaching for Change	0
Social Justice Booklist	0
Center for Civic Education	0
Stanford History Education Group	0
Zinn Education Project	0
Annenberg Classroom	0
Anti-Defamation League	0
Choices Program at Brown University	0
Rethinking Schools	0
New York Times Upfront	0
ProCon	0

Name	Weighted Percentage Using
Teaching Hard History	0

NOTE: This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that they regularly use a material at least once a week. Respondents who were assigned to the elementary school grade level path and science subject path and indicated that they taught "Social Studies" as part of their regular teaching assignment were instructed to respond to these items.

Supports for and Perceptions of Instructional Materials

Table 2.17. Indicate the Extent to Which the ELA/Mathematics Curriculum Materials Provided by Your District or School as a Recommendation or Requirement Are Adequate for Each Purpose Listed Below (*n* = 5,504)

	Weighted Percentage	
Category	**ELA**	**Mathematics**
Helping all students master my state's ELA standards	49	49
Covering content addressed by benchmark assessments	54	62
Covering content addressed by my state-mandated assessment	54	59
Meeting the needs of students with individualized education plans (IEPs) or 504 plans	35	33
Meeting the needs of English learners	30	28
Accelerating the learning of students who are performing below grade level	33	34
Helping me provide culturally relevant instruction	45	27
Providing digital instructional materials for use by all students	47	53
Providing a manageable number of topics to teach in a school year	52	54
Making learning engaging for students	44	44
Reflecting students' interests or experiences	40	31
Providing real-world tasks that have applications outside of school	39	45
Providing me with strategies to improve my instruction	41	44
Supporting students' social and emotional learning	27	19
Providing lessons that are easy for me to implement in the classroom	52	55
Reflecting the diversity of identities within my classroom	41	29
Helping my students identify their own biases or the biases of others	30	16
Provide multiple means of representation (e.g., ways to display information or aid in comprehension)	47	56
Provide multiple means of expression (e.g., ways for students to communicate)	47	50

NOTES: Respondents were asked to indicate the adequacy of each purpose on a 7 point scale with 1 = completely inadequate, 4 = inadequate in some ways, adequate in others, and 7 = completely adequate. This table presents the percentage of respondents who selected a response of 5 or above for each purpose. Respondents who indicated that they had any curriculum recommended or required by their school or district were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.18. Who Helps You Address Inadequacies You Have Identified Within ELA/Mathematics Materials Provided by Your School or District? (*n* = 6,277)

	Weighted Percentage	
Category	**ELA**	**Mathematics**
No one—I address them on my own	33	34
Other teachers at my school	48	48
My school leader	17	16
District administrators (including curriculum supervisors)	25	25
Other	7	7
N/A: I have not identified any inadequacies within the ELA/mathematics materials my school or district provides.	3	2

NOTE: N/A = not applicable.

Table 2.19. Who Would You Most Prefer to Help You Address Inadequacies You Have Identified Within the ELA/Mathematics Materials Provided by Your School or District? (*n* = 6,137)

	Weighted Percentage	
Category	**ELA**	**Mathematics**
I would prefer to address them on my own	17	17
I would prefer help from other teachers at my school	37	37
I would prefer help from my school leader	12	10
I would prefer help from my district administrators (including curriculum supervisors)	30	32
Other	4	3

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they identified inadequacies within the materials provided by their school or district were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.20. Please Complete the Following Sentence: The ELA/Mathematics/Science Curriculum Materials Provided by My District or School as a Recommendation or Requirement Are . . . (*n* = 6,725)

	Weighted Percentage		
Category	**ELA**	**Mathematics**	**Science**
. . . too challenging for the majority of my students	34	37	18
. . . at the right level for the majority of my students	50	53	61
. . . not challenging enough for the majority of my students	11	7	14

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they had any curriculum recommended or required by their school or district were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.21. Who Is the Primary Decisionmaker (i.e., the Person or People Who Typically Make Most of the Decisions) About Which ELA/Mathematics/Science/Social Studies Instructional Materials You Use in Your Classroom Each Day? (*n* = 7,906)

	Weighted Percentage			
Category	**ELA**	**Mathematics**	**Science**	**Social Studies**
Me	32	31	40	38
Teachers in my school system (including or excluding me)	18	17	20	21
My principal	5	4	3	3
My district leaders	42	46	35	36
Someone else (please indicate who):	3	1	2	1

NOTE: Social studies items were asked only of elementary school teachers.

Table 2.22. Rank the Top Five Priorities That Determined Which Tasks or Activities from Those Materials You Decided to Use for Your ELA/Mathematics/Science/Social Studies Instruction (*n* = 7,882)

	Weighted Percentage			
Category	**ELA**	**Mathematics**	**Science**	**Social Studies**
Were ones my school or district expects me to use	35	37	48	41
Were engaging for students	76	70	89	84
Provided scaffolds or supports to help students master grade-level content	63	66	55	30
Reviewed content from prior grade levels that students have missed or not mastered	28	46	21	7
Helped my students advance beyond mastery of grade-level content	28	34	27	8
Were easy for me to enact in both virtual and physical classroom settings	19	22	32	17
Provided options for students with IEPs or 504 Plans	26	27	21	10
Provided options for English learners	18	13	16	12
Activated diverse cultural background knowledge of students	23	6	12	27
Provided authentic opportunities for students to understand and reflect upon their own identities and identities of others	31	18	27	34
Promoted social and emotional learning	21	8	17	32
Were easily integrated with my school's technology	24	27	48	27
Were aligned with my state's academic standards for my subject	66	73	82	64
Were aligned with my state's academic standards for ELA	—	—	—	30
Were aligned with my state-mandated ELA/Mathematics assessment	40	50	—	—
Other	2	2	4	2

NOTES: Respondents were instructed to rank the top five priorities among the list of priorities listed. This table presents the percentage of respondents who ranked a priority within their top five. Dashes (—) indicate that an item was not asked to teachers in that subject path. Social studies items were posed only to elementary school teachers.

Table 2.23. Did Your School or District Purchase Additional ELA/Mathematics Teaching and Learning Materials for You or Your Students to Use This Year That You Do Not Use? (*n* = 6,239)

	Weighted Percentage	
Category	**ELA**	**Math**
No	63	70
Yes	18	15
I don't know	19	15

Table 2.24. To What Extent Do You Need More or Better ELA/Mathematics Curriculum Materials for the Following Purposes? (*n* = 6,218)

	Weighted Percentage	
Category	**ELA**	**Mathematics**
Engage students	58	58
Provide scaffolds or supports to help students master grade-level content	56	56
Review content from prior grade levels that students have missed or not mastered	52	54
Help students advance beyond mastery of grade-level content	52	51
Are easy to enact in both virtual and physical classroom settings	33	29
Provide options for students with IEPs or 504 plans	55	49
Provide options for English learners	49	45
Activate diverse cultural background knowledge of students	47	43
Provide opportunities for students to reflect upon their own identity or identities	44	36
Promote social and emotional learning	50	41
Easily integrated with my school's technology	39	35
Aligned with my state's academic standards for ELA/mathematics	35	32
Aligned with my state-mandated ELA/mathematics assessment	33	32
Other	17	21

NOTE: This table shows the percentage of teachers who indicate that each purpose was a moderate need or major need.

Table 2.25. Thus Far This School Year (2021–2022), Please Estimate How Much of Your Own Money You Have Spent on ELA/Mathematics Teaching or Learning Materials That Will Not Be Reimbursed by Your School or District (*n* = 6,209)

	Weighted Percentage	
Category	**ELA**	**Mathematics**
0 dollars	12	16
1–100 dollars	31	42
101–200 dollars	20	17
201–300 dollars	16	11
301–400 dollars	4	3
401–500 dollars	9	5
More than 500 dollars	9	6

Table 2.26. Which of the Following Does Your School Principal Most Encourage You to Use as the Basis for Your ELA/Mathematics Lesson Plans (*n* = 6,215)

	Weighted Percentage	
Category	**ELA**	**Mathematics**
My recommended or required ELA/mathematics materials	48	46
Materials I have developed on my own	3	2
Materials I have developed in collaboration with other ELA/mathematics teachers	11	9
Whatever materials I think will best meet my students needs	36	41
Other	3	2

Classroom Practice

Table 2.27. In the Last Five Lessons You Taught This Class (i.e., the Past Week, If You Teach Every Day), How Often Did Students Engage in Each of the Following Tasks, With or Without Your Prompting? (*n* = 3,607)

	Weighted Percentage				
Category	**Never**	**1–2 Lessons**	**3–4 Lessons**	**Every Lesson**	**Not Relevant or Not Appropriate for the Grade/Class I Teach**
Focused on the same, grade-level, fictional text as a whole class	11	29	30	26	4
Focused on the same, grade-level, nonfiction text as a whole class	16	38	23	18	5
Focused on different texts depending on their reading levels	24	28	21	22	4
Focused on a text that includes perspectives of individuals of diverse ethnicities	16	40	22	18	5
Applied phonics skills in decoding words	28	20	14	29	9
Used evidence from a text to support their ideas during class discussion	1	17	31	49	2
Used evidence from a text to support their ideas in a writing task	3	30	30	34	3
Built on the ideas of other students during classroom discussion	5	31	31	31	3
Applied academic or domain specific vocabulary (i.e., words and phrases) they have learned in writing or speaking	4	29	31	34	2

NOTE: All K–12 respondents who were assigned to the ELA subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.28. Think of the Same ELA Class and Five Lessons You Responded About for the Previous Question. Over Those Five Lessons, What Proportion of Your Students Were Able to Undertake Each Task Successfully? (*n* = 3,582)

	Weighted Percentage			
Category	A Few Students	More Than a Few Students but Less Than Half the Class	About Half the Class	More Than Half the Class
Focused on the same, grade-level, fictional text as a whole class	5	10	21	65
Focused on the same, grade-level, non-fiction text as a whole class	5	10	25	59
Focused on different texts depending on their reading levels	7	12	24	58
Focused on a text that includes perspectives of individuals of diverse ethnicities	7	14	28	52
Applied phonics skills in decoding words	5	15	28	52
Used evidence from a text to support their ideas during class discussion	4	15	31	50
Used evidence from a text to support their ideas in a writing task	4	17	31	48
Built on the ideas of other students during classroom discussion	5	21	35	39
Applied academic or domain specific vocabulary (i.e., words and phrases) they have learned in writing or speaking	5	22	33	40

NOTE: K–12 Respondents who indicated that students engaged in each activity at least once over the past five lessons were instructed to respond to the items in this table for those lessons.

Table 2.29. Think of the Mathematics Class You Teach This School Year (2021–2022). Or, If You Teach More Than One Mathematics Class, Think of the First Mathematics Class You Teach Each Week. In the Last Five Lessons You Taught This Class (i.e., the Past Week, If You Teach Every Day), How Often Did Students Engage in Each of the Following Tasks, With or Without Your Prompting? (*n* = 2,589)

	Weighted Percentage				
Category	Never	1–2 Lessons	3–4 Lessons	Every Lesson	Not Relevant or Not Appropriate for the Grade/Class I Teach
Spent most instructional time on grade-level mathematics topics addressed by their state mathematics standards	1	8	20	70	1
Related new mathematics content to other mathematics content at prior grade levels	5	34	30	26	5
Related new mathematics content to other mathematics content within their grade level	3	27	35	34	2

Category	Weighted Percentage				
	Never	1–2 Lessons	3–4 Lessons	Every Lesson	Not Relevant or Not Appropriate for the Grade/Class I Teach
Reviewed mathematics content at prior grade levels without connecting it to new mathematics content	35	29	16	13	5
Focused on building their conceptual understanding	2	19	30	48	1
Focused on building their fluency with using mathematics procedures to solve problems	2	24	30	43	1
Focused on applying mathematics learning to real-world contexts	4	31	30	34	1
Explained their mathematical thinking	4	24	31	40	1
Built on the thinking of other students	8	33	28	29	1
Made sense of problems that did not include clear solution procedures	11	35	28	22	3
Chose which tools to use to solve a problem	8	29	29	33	2
Chose which methods to use to solve a problem	3	24	33	38	2

NOTE: All K–12 respondents who were assigned to the mathematics subject path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 2.30. Think of the Same Mathematics Class and Five Lessons You Responded About for the Previous Question. Over Those Five Lessons, What Proportion of Your Students Were Able to Undertake Each Task Successfully? (*n* = 2,576)

Category	Weighted Percentage			
	A Few Students	More Than a Few Students but Less Than Half the Class	About Half the Class	More Than Half the Class
Spent most instructional time on grade-level mathematics topics addressed by their state mathematics standards	5	11	24	59
Related new mathematics content to other mathematics content at prior grade levels	7	19	35	39
Related new mathematics content to other mathematics content within their grade level	8	16	35	41
Reviewed mathematics content at prior grade levels without connecting it to new mathematics content	14	23	33	30
Focused on building their conceptual understanding	7	19	35	39
Focused on building their fluency with using mathematics procedures to solve problems	5	18	34	42
Focused on applying mathematics learning to real-world contexts	10	23	32	35
Explained their mathematical thinking	11	22	36	31
Built on the thinking of other students	14	27	31	28
Made sense of problems that did not include clear solution procedures	13	29	33	25
Chose which tools to use to solve a problem	8	19	38	36
Chose which methods to use to solve a problem	6	19	37	38

NOTE: K–12 respondents who indicated that students engaged in each activity at least once over the past five lessons were instructed to respond to the items in this table for those lessons.

Table 2.31. What Science Course(s) Do You Teach? (*n* = 379)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Biology	47
Chemistry	27
Physics	32
Physical or earth science	69
Other	22

NOTE: Respondents who were assigned to the science and high school branches of the survey were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.32. Do Students Need to Take Any Mathematics Prerequisites to Take Any Science Courses You Teach? (*n* = 1,628)

Category	Weighted Percentage
No	91
Yes	8
I don't know	1

NOTE: Respondents who were assigned to the science branch of the survey were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.33. Is Your School Currently Implementing the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) Standards or Standards Similar to NGSS (i.e., Based on the K–12 Framework for Science Education)? (*n* = 1,628)

Category	Weighted Percentage
No	22
Yes	64
I don't know	14

NOTE: Respondents who were assigned to the science branch of the survey were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.34. Please Indicate Which Approach Comes Closest to Describing How Your School Currently Approaches Teaching Science in Grades 6–8? (*n* = 379)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Integrated or spiraled model: Students are exposed to a combination of earth, space, life, and physical sciences at each grade level	54
Traditional discipline or topic-specific model: Topics are grouped together within grade level roughly by discipline (e.g., earth and space science in 6th grade, life science in 7th grade, and physical science in 8th grade)	46

NOTE: Respondents who were assigned to the science branch of the survey and who taught one of grades 6–8 were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.35. If Your School Switched from a Traditional Discipline or Topic-Specific Model to an Integrated or Spiraled Approach, Did You Go Through Professional Development to Support You in Incorporating This Change? (*n* = 230)

Category	Weighted Percentage
No	12
Yes	36
N/A—My school did not switch models during my time as a teacher	52

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. Respondents who were assigned to the science branch of the survey, who taught one grade of grades 6–8, and who indicated that their school uses an integrated or spiral model were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.36. If Your School Switched from a Traditional Discipline or Topic-Specific Model to an Integrated or Spiraled Approach, Did You Receive New Curriculum Materials That Are Aligned with This New Approach? (*n* = 229)

Category	Weighted Percentage
No	10
Yes	38
N/A—My school did not switch models during my time as a teacher	53

NOTE: Respondents who were assigned to the science branch of the survey, who taught one grade of grades 6–8, and who indicated that their school uses an integrated or spiral model were instructed to respond to this item.

Anti-Bias Instruction

Table 2.37. To What Extent Is Anti-Bias Education a Part of the Curriculum You Teach or Part of Your Teaching Practices This School Year (2021–2022)? (*n* = 7,780)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Not at all	38
To a small extent	31
To a moderate extent	21
To a large extent	10

NOTE: Respondents were provided with the following definition of *anti-bias education*: "Anti-bias education is an approach to education that emphasizes the development of students' positive social identities and fosters their comfort and respect for all dimensions of diversity, including, for example, race and ethnicity, gender identity, religious identity, immigration status, sexual identity, socioeconomic status, and ability status. It is also intended to raise their awareness of and promote their capacity to act against bias and injustice."

Table 2.38. Where Do You Get the Instructional Materials You Use to Provide Anti-Bias Instruction? (*n* = 4,753)

Category	Weighted Percentage
I create them	38
I find them myself online or from other sources	55
Teachers in my school or district find or create them	32
My school or district provides them	34
Other	4

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that anti-bias education is a part of the curriculum that they teach were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.39. What Instructional Materials Do You Use to Provide Anti-Bias Instruction? (*n* = 4,750)

Category	Percentage Using	Percentage Using Regularly	Percentage Required or Recommended
I teach anti-bias topics without the use of instructional materials (e.g., classroom discussions with students)	54	25	4
Teachers Pay Teachers	41	19	1
Current events articles or websites (e.g., *NewsELA*, *New York Times*, *TIME for Kids*, *Scholastic News*)	39	16	3
YouTube	34	16	1
Other	13	4	4
CommonLit	11	4	1
Learning for Justice (formerly Teaching Tolerance)	11	3	1
Facing History and Ourselves	5	1	0
Teaching for Change	5	2	1
Rethinking Schools	4	1	0
The 1619 Project	4	1	0
Anti-Defamation League	3	1	0
Anti-Bias Education for Young Children and Ourselves (National Association for the Education of Young Children)	2	1	0
Zinn Education Project	2	0	0

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that anti-bias education is a part of the curriculum they teach were instructed to respond to this item. *Percentage using* refers to the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were using that material to provide anti-bias instruction. *Percentage using regularly* refers to the percentage of respondents who use that material once a week or more. *Percentage required or recommended* refers to the percentage of respondents who indicated that material was "required or recommended by my school or district."

Table 2.40. Some States and School Systems Have Recently Placed Limitations on How K–12 Public School Teachers Address Topics Related to Race or Gender. Has Your State or School System Recently Placed Limitations on How K–12 Public School Teachers Address Topics Related to Race or Gender? (*n* = 7,775)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Yes—my state has	12
Yes—my school system has	5
No	57
I don't know	27

Table 2.41. To What Extent Have the Limitations Placed on What Topics Teachers Can Address Influenced Your Choice of Curriculum Materials or Instructional Practices, Regardless of Where You Teach? (*n* = 7,768)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Not at all	41
To a slight extent	13
To a moderate extent	7
To a large extent	4
N/A—I am not aware of limitations placed on race- or gender-related topics by states or school systems	35

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. Respondents who indicated that limitations placed on topics teachers can address have influenced their choice of curriculum materials or instructional practices were instructed to respond to this item.

Professional Learning

Table 2.42. This School Year (2021–2022), How Often Have You Participated in the Following Types of Activities Intended to Support Your [ELA/Mathematics/Science] Instruction? (*n* = 7,761)

	Weighted Percentage				
Category	Never	1–3 Times per Year	4–6 Times per Year	1–3 Times per Month	Weekly or More Often
Professional development workshops or trainings	15	42	26	13	4
Coaching	52	25	8	9	5
Collaborative learning with other teachers (e.g., Professional Learning Communities), including instructional planning time	7	20	14	22	39
Other	80	6	5	5	4

Table 2.43. For the Professional Development Workshops or Trainings in Which You Have Participated to Support Your [ELA/Math/Science] Instruction This School Year (2021–2022), What Approximate Proportion of That Time Has Been Spent on Each of the Following Activities? (*n* = 6,803)

	Weighted Percentage			
Category	No Time	1–25 Percent of the Time	26–50 Percent of the Time	More Than 50 Percent of the Time
Learning about [ELA/math/science] standards, content, or pedagogy	21	44	23	13
Creation of [ELA/math/science] curriculum materials	35	38	19	8
Use or adaption of existing [ELA/math/science] curriculum materials	23	40	25	13
Analysis or use of student assessments	19	40	28	13
Student behavior or classroom management	42	37	14	7
Supporting students' mental health	32	44	19	5
Attending to the diversity of identities within my classroom	43	38	14	4
Other	76	8	9	7

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they participated in professional development workshops or trainings at least 1–3 times per year were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.44. For the Coaching in Which You Have Participated to Support Your [ELA/Math/Science] Instruction This School Year (2021–2022), What Approximate Proportion of That Time Has Been Spent on Each of the Following Activities? (*n* = 3,780)

	Weighted Percentage			
Category	No Time	1–25 Percent of the Time	26–50 Percent of the Time	More Than 50 Percent Of The Time
Observations of my [ELA/math/science] instruction	22	46	21	11
Feedback on my [ELA/math/science] instructional practices	19	48	22	10
Feedback on my use of my [ELA/math/science] curriculum materials	25	47	19	8
Feedback on my classroom management	29	46	17	8
Other	69	6	11	14

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they participated in coaching at least 1–3 times per year were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.45. For the Collaborative Learning with Other Teachers (Including Instructional Planning Time) in Which You Have Participated to Support Your [ELA/Math/Science] Instruction This School Year (2021–2022), What Approximate Proportion of That Time Has Been Spent on Each of the Following Activities? (*n* = 7,270)

	Weighted Percentage			
Category	**No Time**	**1–25 Percent of the Time**	**26–50 Percent of the Time**	**More Than 50 Percent of the Time**
Learning about [ELA/math/science] standards, content, or pedagogy	21	47	21	10
Creation of [ELA/math/science] curriculum materials	20	38	27	14
Use or adaption of existing [ELA/math/science] curriculum materials	13	40	31	17
Analysis or use of student assessments	13	42	31	15
Student behavior or classroom management	32	42	18	8
Supporting students' mental health	35	43	16	5
Attending to the diversity of identities within my classroom	42	40	13	4
Other	88	3	5	3

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they participated in collaborative learning at least 1–3 times per year were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.46. To What Extent Has Each Activity in Which You Have Participated to Support Your Instruction Improved Your Teaching or Student Learning in [ELA/Math/Science]? (*n* = 7,539)

	Weighted Percentage			
Category	**Not at All**	**To a Slight Extent**	**To a Moderate Extent**	**To a Large Extent**
Professional development workshops or trainings	13	44	33	11
Coaching	15	44	31	11
Collaborative learning with other teachers (e.g., Professional Learning Communities), including instructional planning time	5	23	41	31
Other	12	19	43	26

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they participated in at least one type of professional learning activity were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.47. To What Extent Have You Had Access to Expertise from Others in the Following Areas for the Professional Learning and Instructional Planning Activities in Which You Have Participated This School Year to Support Your [ELA/Math/Science] Instruction? (*n* = 7,748)

	Weighted Percentage			
Category	**Not at All**	**To a Slight Extent**	**To a Moderate Extent**	**To a Large Extent**
Expertise in supporting students with IEPs or 504 plans	26	38	25	10
Expertise in supporting English learners	38	37	19	7
Expertise in [ELA/math/science] content	21	33	32	14
Expertise in use of my required or recommended [ELA/math/science] materials	24	34	30	12

Benchmark Assessments

Table 2.48. Which Benchmark Assessments Have Your Students Already Taken This School Year (2021–2022) to Assess Their Progress in ELA and Mathematics? (*n* = 6,139)

Assessment	**Used for ELA**	**Used for Mathematics**
A published benchmark assessment my school or district requires that I give students	79	72
Benchmark assessments I created myself	26	22
My students haven't taken a benchmark assessment in this subject	7	8
Other	5	4
I don't know	7	9

Table 2.49. Please Estimate Current Average Achievement of Your Students in ELA and Mathematics. If Your Students Have Taken Benchmark Assessments This Year, Please Use Students' Performance on Those Assessments to Inform Your Estimates (*n* = 7,752)

	Weighted Percentage					
Category	**Far Below Grade Level (i.e., by more than one grade)**	**Somewhat Below Grade Level**	**At Grade Level**	**Somewhat Above Grade Level**	**Far Above Grade Level (i.e., by more than one grade)**	**N/A or Not Sure**
ELA achievement	11	35	28	15	3	9
Math achievement	12	31	28	12	3	14

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. Respondents who indicated that their students had taken a benchmark assessment were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.50. To What Extent Do the [ELA/Mathematics] Benchmark Assessments Your Students Take Align with the Content of the Curriculum Materials You Use Regularly for Your [ELA/Mathematics] Instruction? (*n* = 5,653)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Not at all aligned	3
A little aligned	10
Partially aligned	23
Mostly aligned	48
Totally aligned	16

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that their students had taken a benchmark assessment were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.51. When Your Benchmark Assessments Indicate Your Students Have Unmet Learning Needs, How Difficult or Easy Is It for You to Identify Tasks or Activities Within Your [ELA/Math] Curriculum Materials to Address Those Needs? (*n* = 5,654)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Very difficult	8
Somewhat difficult	30
Neither difficult nor easy	26
Somewhat easy	28
Very easy	8

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that their students had taken a benchmark assessment were instructed to respond to this item.

Teacher Preparation

Table 2.52. How Long Ago Did You Complete Your Formal Teacher Preparation Program? (*n* = 7,753)

Category	Weighted Percentage
In the last five years (2017 or later)	7
6–10 years ago (between 2012 and 2017)	18
More than 10 years ago (before 2012)	73
N/A—I did not complete a formal teacher preparation program	2

Table 2.53. Please Select the Type of Program Through Which You Were Prepared to Teach (*n* = 2,107)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Traditional teacher preparation program	75
Alternative certification program	24
I don't know	1

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they completed their formal teacher preparation program within the past ten years were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.54. Which of the Following Did Your Program Emphasize More (Pick One)? (*n* = 2,107)

Category	Weighted Percentage
My program emphasized how to develop my own lessons and unit plans	43
My program emphasized how to skillfully use and modify curricula provided to me	8
My program emphasized both of these approaches equally	33
My program emphasized neither of these approaches	10
I do not recall what my program emphasized more	7

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they completed their formal teacher preparation program within the past ten years were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.55. What Approximate Proportion of Your Teacher Preparation Program Coursework (Excluding Your Clinical Teaching Work) Was Spent on Each of the Following Topics? (*n* = 2,107)

	Weighted Percentage				
Category	No Time	1–25 Percent of the Time	26–50 Percent of the Time	More Than 50 Percent of the Time	I Do Not Recall
Learning about [ELA/math/science] standards, content or pedagogy	7	36	28	26	4
Creation of [ELA/math/science] curriculum materials	14	41	28	14	4
Use or adaption of existing [ELA/math/science] curriculum materials	22	45	18	11	5
Identifying high-quality curriculum materials or tasks	16	34	27	19	5
Analysis or use of student assessments	8	33	31	24	4
Student behavior or classroom management	8	37	26	26	3
Supporting students' mental health	36	36	15	8	5
Attending to the diversity of identities within my classroom	18	41	23	14	4
Other	48	7	5	9	31

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they completed their formal teacher preparation program within the past ten years were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.56. What Approximate Proportion of Your Clinical Teaching Experience Was Spent on Each of the Following Topics? (*n* = 2,107)

	Weighted Percentage				
Category	**No Time**	**1–25 percent of the time**	**26–50 percent of the time**	**More than 50 percent of the time**	**I do not recall**
Learning about [ELA/math/science] standards, content or pedagogy	14	35	23	25	4
Creation of [ELA/math/science] curriculum materials	16	36	24	20	4
Use or adaption of existing [ELA/math/science] curriculum materials	12	32	27	25	4
Identifying high-quality curriculum materials or tasks	17	33	25	21	4
Analysis or use of student assessments	8	32	33	24	4
Student behavior or classroom management	7	25	28	37	4
Supporting students' mental health	28	40	16	11	5
Attending to the diversity of identities within my classroom	21	38	21	15	4
Other	53	3	3	7	33

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they completed their formal teacher preparation program within the past ten years were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.57. In What Area(s) Are You Certified to Teach in Your State? (*n* = 7,742)

Category	**Weighted Percentage**
Specific subject areas (K–12) (please specify)	45
Elementary education	61
English learners (K–12)	17
Special education	14
Other	11

Table 2.58. Approximately What Percentage of the Students You Teach—Including Those in Small Push-In or Pull-Out Groups—Are English Learners? (*n* = 7,740)

Category	Weighted Percentage
0 percent	19
1–10 percent	42
11–24 percent	17
25–49 percent	9
50–74 percent	5
75–100 percent	8

Table 2.59. Approximately What Percentage of the Students You Teach Have an IEP and/or 504 Plan? (*n* = 7,740)

Category	Weighted Percentage
0 percent	4
1–10 percent	37
11–24 percent	34
25–49 percent	16
50–74 percent	4
75–100 percent	5

Table 2.60. Approximately What Percentage of the Students You Teach Are Black or Latino? (*n* = 7,740)

Category	Weighted Percentage
0 percent	5
1–10 percent	29
11–24 percent	17
25–49 percent	15
50–74 percent	14
75–100 percent	20

Table 2.61. Approximately What Percentage of the Students You Teach Are Eligible to Receive Free or Reduced-Priced Lunch? (*n* = 7,738)

Category	Weighted Percentage
0 percent	1
1–10 percent	10
11–24 percent	12
25–49 percent	17
50–74 percent	20
75–100 percent	40

Table 2.62. Including the Current School Year (2021–2022), for How Many Years Have You Served as a Teacher Across Your Entire Career? (*n* = 8,063)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Zero to five years	14
Six to ten years	21
11–15 years	21
16–20 years	17
21 years or more	26

Table 2.63. With Which of the Following Do You Identify? (*n* = 7,452)

Category	Weighted Percentage
American Indian/Alaska Native	1
Asian	2
Black/African American	7
Hispanic/Latino/Spanish Origin	10
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0
White	80
Prefer not to state	3
Prefer to self-describe (please specify)	1

Table 2.64. Do You Identify as (*n* = 8,059)

Category	Weighted Percentage
A man	19
A woman	80
Non-binary	0
Prefer to self-describe	0
Prefer not to say	1

Table 2.65. What Is the Highest Degree You Have Earned? (*n* = 8,062)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Associate's degree	0
Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)	32
Master's degree (M.A., M.A.T., M.B.A., M.Ed., M.S., etc.)	60
Doctorate or first professional degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)	2
Do not have a degree	0
Educational specialist or professional diploma (at least one year beyond master's level)	6

Table 2.66. In What Field Was Your Undergraduate Major/s? (*n* = 7,793)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Arts (visual and performing)	2
Area and/or ethnic studies	0
Communications and/or journalism	3
Computer science	1
Biology, biological sciences and/or medicine	5
Business	4
Economics	1
Education	54
Engineering	1
English language and literature	15
Gender studies	0
History	3
International relations and/or diplomacy	0
Languages and linguistics	1
Mathematics	7
Natural sciences	3
Liberal arts	4
Philosophy	0
Physical education	1
Religion	0
Social sciences	6
Technology	0
Other	10

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that their highest degree was a bachelor's degree, master's degree, educational specialist or professional diploma, or doctorate or first professional degree were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 2.67. Which of the Following Best Describes the Teaching Certificate You Currently Hold in the State in Which You Currently Teach? (*n* = 7,798)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Regular or standard state certificate or advanced professional certificate	98
Other type of certificate (e.g., probationary, provisional, temporary, emergency/waiver)	2
I do not hold any of the above certifications in this state	0

Chapter 3. American Instructional Resources Surveys: Principal Survey Results

Your School Assignment

Table 3.1. Are You Still a Leader of a Public School That Serves Any Grades K–12? (*n* = 1,598)

Category	Weighted Percentage
No, I do not work at a public or charter school serving any grades K–12	0
No, I am no longer a school leader	0
Yes, I am a school leader of a public or charter school serving any grades K–12	100

Table 3.2. This School Year (2021–2022), What Grade(s) Are Included in the School You Lead? (*n* = 1,598)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Kindergarten	56
Grade 1	57
Grade 2	57
Grade 3	56
Grade 4	56
Grade 5	53
Grade 6	39
Grade 7	35
Grade 8	35
Grade 9	26
Grade 10	26
Grade 11	27
Grade 12	27
Ungraded (including special education students aged 18–22)	4
Other	14

NOTE: Respondents were instructed to select all that apply. Percentages will not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

General Questions About Your School This Year

Table 3.3. Through the End of March 2022, Approximately How Many Weeks This School Year (2021–2022) Were at Least Some In-Person Classes Suspended or Held Remotely for Your Students Because of the COVID-19 Pandemic? (*n* = 1,519)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Zero weeks	69
One to four weeks	16
Five to nine weeks	3
Ten to 29 weeks	7
30–51 weeks	6
52 weeks	0

Table 3.4. Has Your School or District Adopted New Curriculum, Instructional Materials, or Software in Any of the Following Subjects for This School Year (2021–2022)? (*n* = 1,587)

Category	Weighted Percentage
English language arts	25
Mathematics	23
Science	9
Social studies	8
Other	6
Not applicable because our school or district has not adopted new curriculum, instructional materials, or software	51

Table 3.5. Have You Ever Heard of EdReports? (*n* = 1,582)

Category	Weighted Percentage
No	58
Yes	42

Table 3.6. To the Best of Your Knowledge, Has Your District Used EdReports to Select, Adapt, or Implement Curriculum? (*n* = 659)

Category	Weighted Percentage
No	30
Yes	38
I don't know	32

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they had heard of EdReports were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 3.7. Have You Used EdReports to Select, Modify, or Implement Curriculum? (*n* = 659)

Category	Weighted Percentage
No	63
Yes	37
I don't know	0

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that they had heard of EdReports were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 3.8. Have ELA or Mathematics Materials from Achievethecore.org Ever Been Provided to Teachers at Your School as a Recommendation or Requirement? (*n* = 1,581)

Category	Weighted Percentage
No	80
Yes	20

English Language Arts Instructional Materials

Table 3.9a. Select the Following ELA Curriculum Materials That Are Provided by Your School or District, Either as a Requirement or Recommendation, This School Year (2021–2022) (Elementary School ELA Curriculum, *n* = 620)

Name	Weighted Percentage
Lucy Calkins Unit of Study (Heinemann or Columbia)	21
The Fountas & Pinnell Classroom (Heinemann)	17
Benchmark Advance or Literacy (Benchmark Education)	17
Fundations (Wilson Language Training)	17
Other curriculum materials not listed	15
English language arts curriculum materials my school or district created	13
English language arts curriculum materials teachers create themselves	11
Journeys (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	11
Core Knowledge Language Arts (CKLA) (Amplify)	7
Reading Wonders—2020 (McGraw-Hill Education)	7
Reading Wonders—2017 (McGraw-Hill Education)	6
Engage NY (NYSED)	5
Into Reading—2020 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	5
EL Education or Expeditionary Learning (Imagine Learning)	5
Ready Reading (Curriculum Associates)	4
ReadyGEN (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	4
Wit & Wisdom (Great Minds)	3
MyView Literacy (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	3
Reading Street Common Core (Pearson)	3
Saxon Phonics and Spelling (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3
ARC Core (American Reading Company)	2
Core Knowledge Language Arts (CKLA) (Amplify)—Open Access Version	2
N/A—No particular curriculum is provided as a requirement or recommendation.	2
CommonLit (CommonLit)	2
Collaborative Literacy (Center for Collaborative Classroom)	2
Reach for Reading (National Geographic Learning, Cengage)	1
English Language Arts Guidebook Units—Louisiana Version (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZIllion)	1
English Language Arts Guidebook Units (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	1
Bookworms (Comprehensive Reading Solutions or Open Up Resources)	1
Treasures (Macmillan/McGraw-Hill)	1
Calvert Learning (Edmentum, formerly Calvert)	0
Fishtank Plus (Fishtank Learning)	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year. Respondents assigned to the elementary school path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 3.9b. Select the Following ELA Curriculum Materials That Are Provided by Your School or District, Either as a Requirement or Recommendation, This School Year (2021–2022) (Middle School ELA Curriculum, *n* = 655)

Name	Weighted Percentage
English language arts curriculum materials teachers create themselves	22
English language arts curriculum materials my school or district created	18
Other curriculum materials not listed	12
Edgenuity (Imagine Learning, formerly Edgenuity)	11
StudySync (McGraw-Hill Education)	11
Holt McDougal Literature (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	9
MyPerspectives (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	9
Amplify ELA (Amplify)	9
Lucy Calkins Unit of Study (Heinemann or Columbia)	8
CommonLit (CommonLit)	8
Journeys (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	8
N/A—No particular curriculum is provided as a requirement or recommendation	6
Engage NY (NYSED)	6
Benchmark Advance or Literacy (Benchmark Education)	6
Collections—2017 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	6
Reading Wonders—2020 (McGraw-Hill Education)	5
Reading Wonders—2017 (McGraw-Hill Education)	5
Into Literature (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4
SpringBoard ELA Common Core Edition—2018 (College Board)	3
Wit and Wisdom (Great Minds)	3
Collections—2015 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3
EL Education or Expeditionary Learning (Imagine Learning)	3
ARC Core (American Reading Company)	3
Into Reading—2020 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3
Springboard—2021 (College Board)	2
Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes (Prentice Hall)	2
Ready Reading (Curriculum Associates)	2
ReadyGEN (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	1
English Language Arts Guidebook Units—Louisiana Version (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	1
English Language Arts Guidebook Units (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	1
Paths to College and Career (John Wiley and Sons)	1
Reach for Reading (National Geographic Learning, Cengage Learning)	1
Code X (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, Scholastic)	0
Mirrors and Windows (Carnegie Learning, formerly EMC Publishing Company)	0
Developing Core Literacy Proficiencies (Odell Education)	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year. Respondents assigned to the middle school path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 3.9c. Select the Following ELA Curriculum Materials That Are Provided by Your School or District, Either as a Requirement or Recommendation, This School Year (2021–2022) (High School ELA Curriculum, *n* = 271)

Name	Weighted Percentage
English language arts curriculum materials teachers create themselves	36
English language arts curriculum materials my school or district created	32
Edgenuity (Imagine Learning, formerly Edgenuity)	23
N/A—No particular curriculum is provided as a requirement or recommendation	14
Holt McDougal Literature (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	13
MyPerspectives (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	12
CommonLit (CommonLit)	9
Pearson Literature (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	8
StudySync (McGraw-Hill Education)	8
Springboard—2021 (College Board)	8
SpringBoard ELA Common Core Edition—2018 (College Board)	8
Into Literature (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	6
Engage NY (NYSED)	5
Collections—2017 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4
Other curriculum materials not listed	4
Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes (Prentice Hall)	3
Collections—2015 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	1
English Language Arts Guidebook Units (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	1
Paths to College and Career (John Wiley and Sons)	1
ARC Core (American Reading Company)	1
Fishtank Plus (Fishtank Learning)	0
Mirrors and Windows: Connecting with Literature (Carnegie Learning, formerly EMC Publishing Company)	0
English Language Arts Guidebook Units—Louisiana Version (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion)	0
Developing Core Literacy Proficiencies (Odell Education)	0
Odell Education High School Literacy Program—2020 (Odell Education)	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year. Respondents assigned to the high school path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 3.10. Beyond Curricula, Please Select the Additional Instructional Materials That Are Required or Recommended by Your School or District for ELA Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (Additional ELA Instructional Materials, *n* = 1,544)

Name	Weighted Percentage
Kahoot!	37
Newsela	27
iReady	26
BrainPOP	26
Quizlet	24
Khan Academy	23
Nearpod	22
Flipgrid	21
RAZ Kids	20
ixl.com	18
Scholastic News	16
Teachers Pay Teachers	16
Flocabulary	15
Accelerated Reader (Renaissance)	14
EdPuzzle	14
Epic!	14
Lexia (Rosetta Stone)	13
Seesaw	13
PearDeck	13
YouTube	12
Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) (Fountas and Pinnell)	12
State department of education website	12
Read 180 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	10
MobyMax	10
N/A—No particular curriculum is provided as a requirement or recommendation	9
Achieve 3000	9
ReadWorks	9
Using a search engine (e.g., Google)	9
Wilson Reading System	8
Edutopia	8
Quizizz	8
Freckle	8
Study Island (Edmuntum)	7
NoRedInk	7
Starfall	7
TIME for Kids	7
Istation	6
Common Core State Standards Initiative	6
Edmodo	6
mClass (Amplify Education, Inc.)	6
ABCya!	5
Other	5
Storyworks (Scholastic)	5
SPIRE	5

Name	Weighted Percentage
95 Percent Group	5
Blooket	5
Resources obtained through social media sites	4
Achieve the Core	4
Reading Plus	4
LearnZillion	4
A leveled literacy intervention program not listed above (please specify)	3
ReadWriteThink	3
WonderWorks (McGraw Hill)	3
Quill	2
Common Sense Education	2
Read Theory	1
Teaching Channel	1
BetterLesson	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year.

Table 3.11a. Select the Following Mathematics Curriculum Materials That Are Provided by Your School or District, Either as a Requirement or Recommendation, This School Year (2021–2022) (Elementary School Math Curriculum, *n* = 620)

Name	Weighted Percentage
Ready or iReady Classroom Mathematics (Curriculum Associates)	19
Eureka Math (Great Minds)	13
Go Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	13
enVision Math—2020 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	10
EngageNY (NYSED)	10
Mathematics curriculum materials my school or district created	9
Bridges In Mathematics (Math Learning Center)	9
enVision Math 2.0—2016 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	8
Other curriculum materials not listed	8
Zearn (Zearn, Inc.)	8
Mathematics curriculum materials teachers create themselves	7
Math Expressions—2018 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4
My Math—2020 (McGraw-Hill Education)	4
Investigations in Number, Data and Space 3rd Edition—2017 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	4
Illustrative Math K–5 (Imagine Learning, formerly LearnZillion) (Kendall Hunt)	4
enVision Math—2012 (Pearson)	4
Everyday Math—2016 (McGraw Hill Education)	4
My Math—2014 or 2018 (McGraw-Hill Education)	4
Everyday Math 4—2020 (McGraw Hill Education)	3
Into Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3
Math in Focus (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3
N/A—No particular curriculum is provided as a requirement or recommendation	2
Common Core Coach (Triumph Learning or School Specialty, Inc.)	2
Math Expressions—2013 (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	1
Singapore Math (Marshall Cavendish Education Pte Ltd.)	1
Reveal Math, Common Core Edition (McGraw-Hill Education)	1
Saxon Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	1
Big Ideas Math: Modeling Real Life—2019 (Big Ideas Learning, LLC)	1
Connecting Math Concepts (McGraw-Hill Education)	1
Fishtank Plus (Fishtank Learning)	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year. Respondents assigned to the elementary school path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 3.11b. Select the Following Mathematics Curriculum Materials That Are Provided by Your School or District, Either as a Requirement or Recommendation, This School Year (2021–2022) (Middle School Math Curriculum, *n* = 620)

Name	Weighted Percentage
Ready or iReady Classroom Mathematics (Curriculum Associates)	16
Mathematics curriculum materials teachers create themselves	13
Go Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	12
Other curriculum materials not listed	11
Mathematics curriculum materials my school or district created	11
Edgenuity (Imagine Learning, formerly Edgenuity)	11
Eureka Math (Great Minds)	11
enVision Math—2020 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	10
enVision Math 2.0—2016 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	9
Engage NY (NYSED)	9
Glencoe Math (McGraw-Hill Education)	8
Illustrative Math (Kendall Hunt) (LearnZillion) (McGraw Hill)	8
Big Ideas Math—Modeling Real Life—2019 (Big Ideas Learning, LLC)	7
Big Ideas Math—2013 (Big Ideas Learning, LLC)	6
Holt McDougal Mathematics (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	5
N/A—No particular curriculum is provided as a requirement or recommendation	4
Prentice Hall Mathematics (Pearson)	4
Core Connections (CPM Educational Programs)	4
Carnegie Learning Middle School Math Solution—2018 (Carnegie Learning)	3
Open Up Resources 6-8 Math or Illustrative Math (Open Up Resources)	3
Into Math (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	2
Connected Mathematics Project 3 (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	2
Common Core Coach (Triumph Learning or School Specialty, Inc.)	1
Reveal Math, Common Core Edition (McGraw-Hill Education)	1
Carnegie Learning Math Series—2011 (Carnegie Learning)	1
Agile Mind Middle School Mathematics (Agile Mind)	1
EdGems (EdGems, LLC)	1
Fishtank Plus (Fishtank Learning)	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year. Respondents assigned to the middle school path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 3.11c. Select the Following Mathematics Curriculum Materials That Are Provided by Your School or District, Either as a Requirement or Recommendation, This School Year (2021–2022) (High School Math Curriculum, *n* = 271)

Name	Weighted Percentage
Curriculum materials my school or district created	37
Edgenuity (Imagine Learning, formerly Edgenuity)	27
N/A—No particular curriculum is provided as a requirement or recommendation	10
Curriculum materials I create myself	8
Glencoe Traditional (McGraw-Hill Education)	8
Pearson Integrated (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	7
Engage NY (NYSED)	6
SpringBoard Traditional (College Board)	6
HMH Traditional (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	6
Pearson Traditional (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	6
Other curriculum materials not listed	6
Big Ideas Traditional (Big Ideas Learning, LLC)	5
CPM Integrated Math (CPM Education Program)	5
Illustrative Math (Kendall Hunt)	5
Carnegie Integrated (Carnegie Learning)	5
HMH Integrated (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	5
Holt McDougal Larson Traditional Series (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	4
Agile Mind Traditional A/G/A [Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II] (Agile Mind)	4
Carnegie Learning Math Solution Traditional (Carnegie Learning)	3
enVision A/G/A [Algebra I/Geometry/Algebra II] (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	3
CPM Traditional Math (CPM Education Program)	3
Into A/G/A [Algebra I/Geometry/Algebra II] (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3
Big Ideas Integrated (Big Ideas Learning, LLC)	3
SpringBoard Integrated (College Board)	2
Core-Plus Mathematics (McGraw-Hill Education)	2
enVision Integrated (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	2
Eureka Math (Great Minds)	2
Agile Mind Integrated Mathematics (Agile Mind)	2
Discovering Mathematics: Algebra, Geometry, Advanced Algebra (Kendall Hunt)	2
Reveal Math Traditional (McGraw-Hill Education)	2
Reveal Math Integrated (McGraw-Hill Education)	1
Interactive Mathematics Program (IMP)—Integrated (Activate Learning)	1
Fishtank Math A/G/A [Algebra I/Geometry/Algebra II] (Fishtank Learning)	1
Open Up High School Mathematics Integrated (Open Up Resources, formerly Mathematics Vision Project)	1
Open Up High School Mathematics Traditional (Open Up Resources, formerly Mathematics Vision Project)	1
enMathInstruction Common Core for High School Mathematics (eMath Instruction, Inc.)	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year. Respondents assigned to the high school path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 3.12. Beyond Curricula, Please Select the Additional Instructional Materials That Are Required or Recommended by Your School or District for Mathematics Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (Additional Math Instructional Materials, *n* = 1,542)

Name	Weighted Percentage
Khan Academy	36
Kahoot!	34
IXL Math	29
i-Ready (Curriculum Associates)	27
BrainPOP	24
Quizlet	23
Desmos	15
Teachers Pay Teachers	12
MobyMax	12
YouTube	12
Prodigy	12
State department of education website	11
N/A—No additional materials are required or recommended	10
Dreambox	10
Freckle	9
Quizziz	9
Zearn	8
ixl.com	8
Study Island (Edmentum)	7
XtraMath	7
Common Core State Standards Initiative (corestandards.org)	6
Reflex	6
Achieve the Core	6
Edutopia	6
Starfall	5
Using a search engine	5
DeltaMath	5
enVision MATH: Diagnosis and Intervention System (Imagine Learning, formerly Pearson)	5
ST Math	5
Go Math! Intervention	5
Other	5
Edmodo	4
Istation	4
Bridges Intervention	4
Resources obtained through social media sites	4
Imagine Learning	4
Do The Math (Scholastic/Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	3
LearnZillion	3
Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) (McGraw-Hill Education)	2
MathXL for School (Pearson)	2
Splash Math	2
Greg Tang Math	2
Kuta Software	2
SuccessMaker (Pearson)	1

Name	Weighted Percentage
cK–12	1
Teaching Channel	1
Illuminations (NCTM)	1
Response to Intervention (RTI) Everyday Intervention (Nasco)	1
Common Sense Education	1
Scholastic Teacher	1
Robert Kaplinsky	1
Teacher.org	0
Mathematics Assessment Project	0
BetterLesson	0
Open Middle	0
Kiddom	0
National Library of Virtual Manipulatives (NLVM)	0
Share My Lesson	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year.

Social Studies Instructional Materials

Table 3.13a. Select the Following Social Studies Curriculum Materials That Are Provided by Your School or District, Either as a Requirement or Recommendation, This School Year (2021–2022) (Elementary School Social Studies Curriculum, *n* = 624)

Name	Weighted Percentage
N/A—No particular curriculum material is provided as a requirement or recommendation	29
Social studies curriculum materials my school or district created	22
Social studies curriculum materials teachers create themselves	19
Studies Weekly (Studies Weekly, Inc.)	19
English language arts curriculum materials	14
Other curriculum materials not listed	10
Social Studies Alive! (TCI)	7
MyWorld Interactive (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	6
Into Social Studies (HMH)	5
IMPACT Social Studies (McGraw Hill)	3
Our World (Five Ponds Press)	2
Inquiry Journeys (InquirED)	1
Nystrom Atlas (Social Studies School Service)	1
Young Citizens (Social Studies School Service)	0
Active Classroom (Social Studies School Service)	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year. Respondents assigned to the elementary school path were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 3.13b. Select the Following Social Studies Curriculum Materials That Are Provided by Your School or District, Either as a Requirement or Recommendation, This School Year (2021–2022) (Middle/High School Social Studies Curriculum, *n* = 921)

Name	Weighted Percentage
Social studies curriculum materials teachers create themselves	25
Social studies curriculum materials my school or district created	22
N/A—No particular curriculum material is provided as a requirement or recommendation	20
US History (McGraw Hill)	18
World History (McGraw Hill)	17
US History (HMH)	12
Other curriculum materials not listed	12
History Alive! (TCI)	8
Government (McGraw-Hill)	8
Civics and Economics (McGraw Hill)	8
World Civilizations (HMH)	8
World Geography (HMH)	7
American History, Middle Grades (Savvas Learning Company, formerly Pearson)	7
US Government (HMH)	6
Economics (HMH)	6
Civics (HMH)	6
English language arts curriculum materials	5
MyWorld Interactive (Savvas)	4
Social Studies Techbooks (Discovery Education)	4
Macgruder's American Government (Savvas Learning Company)	3
Geography Alive! (TCI)	3
Into Social Studies (HMH)	2
World History Interactive (Savvas)	2
US History Interactive (Savvas)	2
Macgruder's Economics (Savvas)	2
Big History Project (OER Project)	1
US History (Discovery Education Techbooks)	1
Social Studies School Service (Nystrom)	1
Global Geography (HMH)	1
Project Imagine United States History (Savvas)	0
Active Classroom (Social Studies School Service)	0
World History Project (OER Project)	0
The American Yawp (Stanford University Press)	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year. Respondents assigned to the middle school or high school paths were instructed to respond to these items.

Table 3.14. Beyond Curricula, Please Select the Additional Instructional Materials That Are Required or Recommended by Your School or District for Social Studies Instruction This School Year (2021–2022) (Additional Social Studies Instructional Materials, *n* = 1,540)

Name	Weighted Percentage
Kahoot!	33
BrainPOP	27
N/A—No additional materials are required or recommended	26
Newsela	24
Scholastic News	22
Quizlet	21
Khan Academy	20
Teachers Pay Teachers	15
YouTube	14
TIME for Kids	13
State department of education website	12
Using a search engine (e.g., Google)	11
Edutopia	11
The DBQ Project	10
ixl.com	10
Seesaw	9
MobyMax	7
Resources obtained through social media sites	5
Study Island (Edmentum)	5
CommonLit	5
Library of Congress Teaching with Primary Sources	5
Smithsonian	5
Teaching Tolerance (Learning for Justice)	4
National Archives	4
iCivics	4
Other (please specify)	4
Common Sense Education	3
Center for Civic Education	3
Anti-Defamation League	3
Bill of Rights Institute	2
Facing History and Ourselves	2
Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History	2
1619 Project	1
National Parks Service Teaching with Historic Places	1
New York Times Upfront	1
Stanford History Education Group	1
Annenberg Classroom	1
Histories Mysteries	1
Teaching for Change	1
ProCon	0
Read.Inquire.Write.	0
Zinn Education Project	0
Choices Program at Brown University	0
Rethinking Schools	0

Name	Weighted Percentage
Teaching Hard History	0
1776 Unites	0
Share My Lesson	0
Social Justice Booklist	0
Native Knowledge 360	0

NOTE: N/A = not applicable. This table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that each material was provided by their school or district, either as a requirement or recommendation, during the 2021–2022 school year.

Supports for and Perceptions of Instructional Materials

Table 3.15. Who Is the Primary Decisionmaker About Which ELA/Mathematics/Social Studies Instructional Materials Teachers Use in Their Classroom Each Day? (*n* = 1,560)

Category	ELA	Mathematics	Social Studies
Individual teachers in their own classrooms	10	10	18
Collaborative group(s) of teachers in my school system	38	37	37
Me and/or other school administrators	10	9	9
My district leaders	40	40	35
Someone else	2	2	2

Table 3.16. Rank the Top Three Priorities That Would Dictate Which ELA/Mathematics/Social Studies Instructional Materials You Require or Recommend That Teachers Use (Regardless of Whether You Require or Recommend Any Materials Right Now) (*n* = 1,547)

	Weighted Percentage		
Category	ELA	Mathematics	Social Studies
Were ones required or recommended by my school district	15	17	15
Were engaging for students	50	50	47
Provided scaffolds or supports to help students master grade-level content	44	48	22
Reviewed content from prior grade levels that students have missed or not mastered	9	13	3
Helped students advance beyond mastery of grade-level content	19	19	10
Were easy for teachers to enact in both virtual and physical classroom settings	7	9	7
Provided options for students with IEPs and/or 504 plans	9	8	7
Provided options for English learners	11	8	7
Activated diverse cultural background knowledge of students	13	7	15
Provided authentic opportunities for students to understand and reflect upon their own identities and identities of others	13	7	17
Promoted social and emotional learning	6	3	7
Were easily integrated with my school's technology	5	6	5
Were aligned with my state's academic standards for that subject	67	67	58
Were aligned with my state's academic standards for ELA	—	—	20
Were aligned with my state-mandated assessment	31	35	—
Included authentic primary and secondary sources to build content knowledge	—	—	24
Included primary and secondary sources created by historically marginalized people	—	—	9
Engaged students in the investigation of compelling questions	—	—	26
Other	1	1	1

NOTE: Respondents were instructed to rank the top three priorities among the list of priorities listed. This table presents the percentage of respondents who ranked a priority within their top three. Dashes (—) indicate a priority was not asked about for that subject.

Table 3.17. Thinking About This School Year (2021–2022), How Often Has Your District or School Provided the Following Types of Professional Learning Activities to Teachers at Your School Specifically to Support Their ELA/Mathematics/Social Studies Instruction (*n* = 1,513)?

	Weighted Percentage					
	ELA		Mathematics		Social Studies	
Category	At least once a year	At least once a month	At least once a year	At least once a month	At least once a year	At least once a month
Professional development workshops or trainings	95	20	93	18	70	10
Coaching	83	37	78	32	54	17
Collaborative learning with other teachers (e.g., Professional Learning Communities), including instructional planning time	98	62	96	57	79	38
Other	44	21	36	17	34	13

NOTE: Respondents were asked to indicate whether their district or school provided the following types of professional learning activities to teachers at their school never, 1–3 times per year, 4–6 times per year, 1–3 times per month, or weekly or more often. This table aggregates responses across these categories into either *at least once a year* or *at least once a month*.

Table 3.18. For Each Type of Professional Learning Teachers Receive to Support Their ELA/Mathematics/Social Studies Instruction, Indicate the Extent to Which That Professional Learning Focuses on Use or Adaption of Teachers' Existing ELA/Mathematics/Social Studies Curriculum Materials (*n* = 1,496)

	Weighted Percentage		
Category	ELA	Mathematics	Social Studies
Professional development workshops or trainings	67	62	45
Coaching	69	63	46
Collaborative learning with other teachers (e.g., Professional Learning Communities), including instructional planning time	80	77	59
Other	65	65	57

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that their district or school provided each type of professional learning activity to teachers at their school were asked to indicate whether that type of activity focuses on the use or adoption of teachers' existing curriculum materials *not at all*, *to a slight extent*, *to a moderate extent*, or *to a large extent*. This table presents the percentage of respondents who indicated that each type of professional learning focused on use or adaption of existing materials *to a moderate extent* or *to a large extent*.

Table 3.19. Please Indicate Whether the Following Professional Learning Activities to Support ELA/Mathematics/Social Studies Instruction Were Provided by District/School Staff or an External Vendor from Outside of Your District (*n* = 1,496)

	Weighted Percentage					
	ELA		Mathematics		Social Studies	
Category	District/School Staff	External Vendor	District/School Staff	External Vendor	District/School Staff	External Vendor
Professional development workshops or trainings	72	28	73	27	84	16
Coaching	89	11	89	11	95	5
Collaborative learning with other teachers (e.g., Professional Learning Communities), including instructional planning time	95	5	95	5	96	4
Other	77	23	88	12	89	11

Table 3.20. Relative to the Support and Instruction Already Provided to Teachers (if any), How Much More or Less Professional Learning Do You Think Teachers Need on the Following Topics to Support Their Instruction? (*n* = 1,508)

	Weighted Percentage				
Category	A Lot Less	Less	No More or Less	A Little More	A Lot More
Learning about ELA standards, content, or pedagogy	1	3	24	52	20
Learning about mathematics standards, content, or pedagogy	0	3	21	50	26
Learning about science standards, content, or pedagogy	1	2	22	47	27
Learning about social studies standards, content, or pedagogy	1	2	23	45	29
Use or adaption of existing ELA curriculum materials	1	4	27	50	18
Use or adaption of existing mathematics curriculum materials	1	3	26	51	19
Use or adaption of existing science curriculum materials	1	3	29	47	20
Use or adaption of existing social studies curriculum materials	1	3	30	44	22
Analysis or use of student assessments	0	1	17	46	35
Student behavior or classroom management	1	4	23	44	28
Supporting students' mental health	0	2	12	38	48
Attending to the diversity of identities within teachers' classroom	1	3	25	37	33
Support for students with IEPs or 504 plans	0	2	19	48	31
Support for English learners	2	3	25	40	30
Other	29	2	23	25	20

Benchmark Assessments

Table 3.21. Which Benchmark Assessments Do Your Students Take over the Course of This School Year (2021–2022) to Assess Their Progress in ELA and Mathematics? (*n* = 1,598)

Assessment	Used for ELA	Used for Mathematics
State-created benchmark assessments	51	51
District-created benchmark assessments	49	49
School-created benchmark assessments	37	37
MAP or Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA)	23	23
iReady Diagnostic (Curriculum Associates)	22	23
iReady Assessments (Curriculum Associates)	18	20
Star Reading / Star Math (Renaissance Learning)	16	14
Star Assessments (Renaissance)	13	9
iReady Standards Mastery (Curriculum Associates)	9	9
FAST (FastBridge Learning)	8	7
Smarter Balanced (SBAC) interim assessment bundles	7	7
Fountas and Pinnell	12	2
aimswebPlus (Pearson)	8	6
Smarter Balanced (SBAC) interim comprehensive assessments	7	6
ACT Aspire (ACT, Inc.)	6	6
Other	6	6
Study Island (Edmentum)	4	4
mCLASS (Amplify)	7	1
DIBELS	7	1
Exact Path (Edmentum)	3	3
Developmental Reading Assessments (DRA) (Pearson)	4	1
Pre-made interim assessment from an item bank	2	2
Adaptive Assessments (Edmentum)	1	2
Collaborative Assessment Solutions for Educators	1	1
Compass Learning (EdGenuity)	1	1
Discovery Education (Discovery Education)	1	1
My students do not take a benchmark assessment for this subject	1	1
Achievement Network (ANet) Interim Assessments	1	0
Free online assessments	1	0
Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt)	1	0
Performance Series Assessments (Scantron)	1	1
We use a benchmark assessment, but I don’t know the name of it	0	1
Achievement Series (Scantron)	0	0
CTB Assessments (McGraw Hill)	0	0
iSTEEP (iSTEEP)	0	0
Previ Learn (CenterPoint)	0	0

Table 3.22. To What Extent Do the ELA/Mathematics Benchmark Assessments Your Students Take Align with Each of the Following? (*n* = 1,496)

	Weighted Percentage				
Category	Not at All Aligned	A Little Aligned	Partially Aligned	Mostly Aligned	Totally Aligned
Content of state ELA standards	0	2	11	59	28
Content of state-mandated ELA summative assessment	1	3	13	58	25
Content of state mathematics standards	0	2	10	59	28
Content of state-mandated mathematics summative assessment	1	2	12	59	26

Table 3.23. Please Estimate the Average Achievement of Students at Your School in ELA and Mathematics Based on Benchmark Assessments Administered in Previous School Years, Prior to COVID-19 (*n* = 1,509)

	Weighted Percentage					
Category	Far Below Grade Level	Somewhat Below Grade Level	At Grade Level	Somewhat Above Grade Level	Far Above Grade Level	N/A—I Do Not Have Knowledge of My Students' Achievement in Previous School Years
ELA achievement	6	29	33	23	8	1
Math achievement	7	31	35	20	6	1

NOTE: N/A = not applicable.

Table 3.24. Based on the Information Provided by Benchmark Assessments This Year (2021–2022), Please Estimate Average Achievement of Students at Your School in ELA and Mathematics (*n* = 1,509)

	Weighted Percentage					
Category	Far Below Grade Level	Somewhat Below Grade Level	At Grade Level	Somewhat Above Grade Level	Far Above Grade Level	N/A—I Haven't Assessed My Students According to Their Grade Level
ELA achievement	7	36	29	22	5	1
Math achievement	10	37	28	19	5	1

NOTE: N/A = not applicable.

Table 3.25. In Which Subject Areas Do You Evaluate Teachers in Your School? (*n* = 1,515)

Category	Weighted Percentage
ELA	92
Math	92
Science	79
Social studies	74
Other	22
N/A—I do not evaluate teachers at my school	3

NOTE: N/A = not applicable.

Table 3.26. Which of the Following Do You Most Encourage ELA/Mathematics/Social Studies Teachers at Your School to Use as the Basis for Their Lesson Plans (Pick One)? (*n* = 1,515)

	Weighted Percentage				
Category	Their Recommended or Required Curriculum Materials	Materials They Have Developed on Their Own	Materials They Have Developed in Collaboration with Other Teachers	Whatever Materials They Think Will Best Meet Their Students' Needs	Other
ELA	59	1	17	20	2
Mathematics	64	1	15	18	2
Social studies	48	4	22	23	2

Table 3.27. To What Extent Are the Following Present in Your School to Support Teachers' Instruction? (*n* = 1,512)

	Weighted Percentage			
Category	**Not Present**	**Present to a Slight Extent**	**Present to a Moderate Extent**	**Present to a Large Extent**
A set of ELA teaching practices that are used by all	5	18	49	28
A set of mathematics teaching practices that are used by all	5	18	47	30
A set of social studies teaching practices that are used by all	16	35	38	11
A set of science teaching practices that are used by all	11	29	43	17
ELA curricula that are aligned with ELA teaching practices my school encourages teachers to use	2	14	46	37
Mathematics curricula that are aligned with mathematics teaching practices my school encourages teachers to use	2	15	47	37
Social studies curricula that are aligned with social studies teaching practices my school encourages teachers to use	12	30	41	17
Science curricula that are aligned with science teaching practices my school encourages teachers to use	6	26	46	23

Table 3.28. Indicate Your Agreement or Disagreement with Each of the Following Statements Describing Connections Among Elements of Your Instructional System (*n* = 1,511)

	Weighted Percentage				
Category	**Strongly Disagree**	**Somewhat Disagree**	**Somewhat Agree**	**Strongly Agree**	**I Don't Know**
Teacher observation protocols I use ask me to consider whether teachers are using curriculum materials provided by my district or school	17	19	31	32	1
Curriculum, instruction, and supplemental materials are well coordinated across the different grade levels at this school	4	11	45	39	1
There is consistency in curriculum, instruction, and supplemental materials among teachers in the same grade level at this school	3	7	37	53	1

Table 3.29. Thinking About This School Year (2021–2022), Indicate Your Agreement or Disagreement with Each of the Following Statements About Your District (*n* = 1,511)

	Weighted Percentage			
Category	**Strongly Disagree**	**Somewhat Disagree**	**Somewhat Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
The district has clear expectations for school-based planning	7	22	48	23
The district conveys the importance of using the standards-aligned curriculum	3	9	42	46
The district has a clear vision for improving student outcomes and provides clear direction on how to achieve that vision	6	21	51	22
The district helps me build school capacity for on-going professional learning and planning related to standards-aligned curricula	6	19	53	21
The district helps me create time and/or opportunities for teacher collaboration on planning and/or improvement of instruction	7	18	50	25
The district helps me create time and/or opportunities for teacher collaboration on use and modifications of their instructional materials	8	21	49	22

Demographics

Table 3.30. In What Area(s) Are You Certified to Teach in Your State? (*n* = 1,504)

Category	**Weighted Percentage**
Specific subject areas (K–12)	50
Elementary education	55
English learners (K–12)	12
Special education	13
Other	11
N/A—I do not have a teacher certification	2

NOTE: N/A = not applicable.

Table 3.31. Approximately What Percentage of the Students at Your School Have an IEP and/or 504 Plan? (*n* = 1,504)

Category	Weighted Percentage
0 percent	0
1–10 percent	25
11-24 percent	65
25-49 percent	9
50-74 percent	0
75–100 percent	0

Table 3.32. Approximately What Percentage of the Students at Your School Are English Learners? (*n* = 1,504)

Category	Weighted Percentage
0 percent	9
1–10 percent	56
11-24 percent	18
25-49 percent	10
50-74 percent	4
75–100 percent	2

Table 3.33. Including This School Year (2021–2022), How Long Have You Worked as a Principal? (*n* = 1,598)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Zero to five years	23
Six to ten years	35
11–15 years	23
16–20 years	11
21 years or more	8

Table 3.34. With Which of the Following Do You Identify? (*n* = 1,560)

Category	Weighted Percentage
American Indian/Alaska Native	2
Asian	2
Black/African American	12
Hispanic/Latino/Spanish origin	8
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1
White	78
Prefer not to state	4
Prefer to self-describe (please specify)	1

Table 3.35. With Which of the Following Do You Identify? (*n* = 1,560)

Category	Weighted Percentage
A man	46
A woman	53
Prefer not to say	1
Prefer to self-describe	0

Table 3.36. What Is the Highest Degree You Have Earned? (*n* = 1,560)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Associate's degree	0
Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)	38
Master's degree (M.A., M.A.T., M.B.A., M.Ed., M.S., etc.)	33
Doctorate or first professional degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)	28
Do not have a degree	0
Educational specialist or professional diploma (at least one year beyond master's level)	0

Table 3.37. In What Field Was Your Undergraduate Major/s? (*n* = 1,560)

Category	Weighted Percentage
Arts (visual and performing)	3
Area and/or ethnic studies	0
Communications and/or journalism	3
Computer science	0
Biology, biological sciences and/or medicine	5
Business	4
Economics	1
Education	55
Engineering	0
English language and literature	10
Gender studies	0
History	9
Internal relations and/or diplomacy	0
Languages and linguistics	2
Mathematics	4
Natural sciences	2
Liberal arts	4
Philosophy	0
Physical education	4
Religion	1
Social sciences	11
Technology	1
Other	8

NOTE: Respondents who indicated that their highest degree was a bachelor's degree, master's degree, educational specialist or professional diploma, or doctorate or first professional degree were instructed to respond to this item.

Table 3.38. Are You Certified and/or Licensed in School Administration? (*n* = 1,559)

Category	Weighted Percentage
No	1
Yes	99

Abbreviations

AAPOR	American Association for Public Opinion Research
AEP	American Educator Panels
AIRS	American Instructional Resources Surveys
ASLP	American School Leader Panel
ATP	American Teacher Panel
CCD	Common Core of Data
CCSSO	Council of Chief State School Officers
CKLA	Core Knowledge Language Arts
COVID-19	coronavirus disease 2019
EL	English learner
ELA	English Language Arts
ESL	English as a second language
FRPL	free or reduced-price lunch
IEP	individualized education program
NCES	National Center for Education Statistics
NGSS	Next Generation Science Standards
NYSED	New York State Education Department
OER	open educational resource

Bibliography

AAPOR—*See* American Association for Public Opinion Research.

American Association for Public Opinion Research, *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*, 9th edition, 2016.

Achieve the Core, "Common Core Knowledge and Practice Survey," webpage, undated. As of January 31, 2020: https://achievethecore.org/page/1104/common-core-knowledge-and-practice-survey

Blazar, David, Blake Heller, Thomas J. Kane, Morgan Polikoff, Douglas Staiger, Scott Carrell, Dan Goldhaber, Douglas Harris, Rachel Hitch, Kristian L. Holden, and Michal Kurlaender, *Learning by the Book: Comparing Math Achievement Growth by Textbook in Six Common Core States*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Center for Education Policy Research, March 2019.

CCSSO—See Council of Chief State School Officers.

Council of Chief State School Officers, *Building on Our Momentum: CCSSO 2019–20 Annual Report*, Washington, D.C., 2020.

Doan, Sy, Maria-Paz Fernandez, David Grant, Julia H. Kaufman, Claude Messan Setodji, Joshua Snoke, Matt Strawn, and Christopher J. Young, *American Instructional Resources Surveys: 2021 Technical Documentation and Survey Results*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RR-A134-10, 2021. As of October 19, 2022: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA134-10.html

Doss, Christopher Joseph, and William R. Johnston, *AEP Data Note Technical Appendix*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RR-2575/1-BMGF, 2018. As of February 11, 2020: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2575z1.html

Elmore, Richard F., Michelle L. Forman, and Elizabeth Leisy Stosich, *Internal Coherence Assessment Protocol*, Washington, D.C.: Strategic Education Research Partnership, 2016.

Kaufman, Julia H., Melissa Kay Diliberti, Gerald P. Hunter, David Grant, Laura S. Hamilton, Heather L. Schwartz, Claude Messan Setodji, Joshua Snoke, and Christopher J. Young, *COVID-19 and the State of K–12 Schools: Results and Technical Documentation from the Fall 2020 American Educator Panels COVID-19 Surveys*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation,, RR-A168-5, 2020. As of October 7, 2021: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA168-5.html

Kaufman, Julia H., Sy Doan, Andrea Prado Tuma, Ashley Woo, Daniella Henry, and Rebecca Ann Lawrence, *How Instructional Materials Are Used and Supported in U.S. K–12 Classrooms: Findings from the American Instructional Resources Survey*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RR-A134-1, 2020. As of July 8, 2020: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA134-1.html

Kaufman, Julia H., V. Darleen Opfer, Michelle Bongard, and Joseph D. Pane, *Changes in What Teachers Know and Do in the Common Core Era: American Teachers Panel Findings from 2015 to 2017,* Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RR-2658-HCT, 2018. As of February 11, 2020: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2658.html

Kaufman, Julia H., V. Darleen Opfer, Michelle Bongard, Joseph D. Pane, and Lindsey E. Thompson, *What Teachers Know and Do in the Common Core Era: Findings from the 2015–2017 American Teacher Panel*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RB-10035-HCT, 2018. As of February 11, 2020: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB10035.html

McFarland, Joel, Bill Hussar, Cristobal de Brey, Tom Snyder, Xiaolei Wang, Sidney Wilkinson-Flicker, Semhar Gebrekristos, Jijun Zhang, Amy Rathbun, Amy Barmer, Farrah Bullock Mann, and Serena Hinz, *The Condition of Education 2017*, Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 2017-144, 2017.

National Center for Education Statistics, *2016–17 Common Core of Data (CCD) Universe Files (2019-052)*, data file, January 2019.

Robbins, Michael W., and David Grant, *RAND American Educator Panels Technical Description*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RR-3104-BMGF, 2020. As of September 30, 2021: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR3104.html

Shanahan, Tim, and Ann Duffett, *Common Core in the Schools: A First Look at Reading Assignments*, Washington, D.C.: Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2013. As of September 30, 2021: http://edexcellence.net/publications/common-core-in-the-schools

Steiner, David, *Curriculum Research: What We Know and Where We Need to Go*, Washington, D.C.: StandardsWork, March 2017.

TNTP, *The Opportunity Myth: What Students Can Show Us About How School Is Letting Them Down—and How to Fix It*, New York, 2018.

University of Chicago, *5Essentials Survey*, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Consortium on School Research, 2017.