Glendale Teachers Association
3233 N. Verdugo Road, Glendale, CA 91208
(818) 240-3924 Fax: (818) 249-0555
www.glendaleteachers.org

ELEMENTARY MATH CURRICULUM SURVEY DECEMBER 2015

Please complete and return to your site rep by Friday December 11th.

Results (350 surveys completed out of 458 1st-6th teachers)

1) Does the open source curriculum supplied by the district (GEMS) provide YOU with the materials you need to:

a) understand and implement a common core curriculum within in your classroom?

☐ Yes **18%** ☐ No **80%** **No Answer 2%**

b) assess and monitor the progress of students in your classroom?

☐ Yes **16%** ☐ No **80%** **No Answer 4%**

c) differentiate instruction for struggling students, ELD students, SPED students and GATE students?

☐ Yes **6%** ☐ No **92%** **No Answer 2%**

2) Which one do you prefer for 2016-2017:

☐ Continue using open source as the primary curriculum. **5%**

☐ Pilot published curriculum, using open source as a supplement. **87%**

☐ I don't know. **7%** **No Answer 1%**

3) Comments:

See attached for a consolidation of all comments.

1. The sequencing is illogical. We don't have supplies needed for the lessons. The lessons are inconsistent in terminology and sequencing. We are spending logs of time and money on supplementing the materials and lessons. The unit assessments are not an accurate reflection of what was taught (because we have to supplement). We need a published curriculum. We were told the reason we didn't get one is because they aren't that good yet. I don't agree. We've looked at GoMath and even if it isn't perfect, it's far better than the Gems curriculum. It's not fair to our students.
2. We did not ever ask for open source. We have voiced our concerns multiple times, and it is time for the District to do the right thing by it's teachers and students.
3. The materials as presented do not provide the lessons and clear progression students need to successfully meet the grade level expectations. Are my students doing well, yes, but it is because I am putting in hours and hours of extra planning, recreating lessons and assessments. I estimate to develop "new" lessons this year, I exceed double the planning time.
4. Open source lacks continuity and logical progression of concepts. Not teacher friendly and not student friendly.
5. This is a proud and successful district. I have taught for over 20 years. I like my job and take it very seriously. Open source is a noble experiment that has failed. The curriculum is slip shod, slapped together and has not been vetted. It does not represent the GUSD that I know. It has merit as a supplement but I doubt it meets Williams Act criteria. No review, howework, differentiation, and other complete curriculum qualities are included. At a practical level pagination is off and teacher's guide and student book are difficult to mesh.
6. We need a Math curriculum!
7. Adopt a curriculum!!!
8. Please give us a program to pilot!
9. Houghton Mifflin Math.
10. Please help!!!
11. I feel like I am not teaching math well at all! The lessons are hodgepodge and assume my students already know so much.
12. I would like the District to pilot published curriculum while I continue to use GEMS.
13. Curriculum writers need to be the authors of a <u>published</u> curriculum!
14. We need a curriculum with proper textbooks. The GEMS is unorganized, incomplete, missing keys, has wrong answers, and not a valuable, trustworthy resource.
15. Very unorganized!
16. The GEMS is very inadequate! We need a published curriculum! As a teacher with 25 years of teaching experience, I feel that the GEMS curriculum is just a lot of reproducibles.
17. I was for this idea last year. However, the results of the materials are unusable. The trainings have been no use.
18. We are not receiving training in open source curriculum in terms of demonstrated lessons, planning, or assessment. We do not receive professional level support in understanding or implementing common core in our classrooms.
19. They (published curriculum) are the professionals who know how to write curriculum suitable for each grade level and user friendly for the teacher. Open source (current) curriculum = very time consuming to follow and teach.
20. Published materials support all learners and lays the foundation for the instruction. We need one. Prentice Hall!! Saxon Math!!
21. No, No, No!
22. Please! No more open source! Scattered format, unreasonable amounts of materials, mistakes! Hard to follow lessons.
23. Please, no more Open Source!

24. I feel like published curriculum would include the manipulatives needed to carry out lessons. Also, the materials and lessons would be outlined for the entire year, so we know what is being taught when.
25. I am a 24 year veteran of Glendale schools and this is the most confusing curriculum I have ever been asked to implement. The number of steps second graders are asked to do for one simple problem are beyond their development. They don't have the printing skills or academic stamina to complete the task. Additionally, there are too many concepts for one presented skill.
26. Although it has been said that there are no good curriculums out there, I know for a fact that what is out there is far better than Open Source. This is such a disservice to our student and community.
27. The eight coaches have done little to nothing in providing teachers with a solid well-developed curriculum. When asked why answers weren't provided in the teacher manuals for all pages, including assessments, the answer was, "It would take too long". Great! Once again, the burden is directly on the classroom teacher. The District had done our students a disservice with this decision. Why don't they listen to teachers? We know first hand what we need in our classrooms.
28. GEMS teachers edition are not user friendly and do not provide adequate teaching materials and lessons. I spend lots of time creating and searching for materials.
29. There are huge gaps between the materials and what the students need to know in order to complete the tasks. Some units have a lot of materials. Some do not. There are often no answer keys.
30. We need a curriculum that offers not only daily lessons, but also homework, extra support, and reteaching opportunities. GEMS is NOT a curriculum!
31. Open Source does not provide HW extension with instruction for home. It might be better to use it as a supplement. Hope we can get a more solid curriculum along with a teacher edition as a pacing guide.
32. Open source <u>is</u> only a supplement now. It is <u>not</u> a curriculum.
33. GEMS is not a curriculum. It doesn't have a sequence where lessons build up upon each other.
34. First Grade, i.e."<>" skill. Test question inc. layers too difficult. Students anxious during math because not simplified enough for their skill and developmental level. Test questions don't test level of skills taught.
35. Standards are "outcome" based. I resent being told, you must teach_____ method. Exposed to multiple methods o.k. Restrictive specific = no good.
36. How about letting us teach to the standards. We know how to do it. When inspecting the common core standards, no where does it specify the means, i.e. algorithms to be used. The standards articulate outcomes, not the means by which the outcomes are reached.
37. Math, too many "methods", not enough explanation. Teachers are not curriculum writers. And you are not giving them enough time to even try to do a half decent job.I feel like it's all over the place.
38. We need to have materials written and designed by professional writers.
39. I would really like to know how the published curriculum would be chosen and by whom?
40. Open source is a mish-mash of approaches and materials not organized into a cohesive whole. Each teacher is pretty much doing their own thing to make sense of what we have. Give us a curriculum to pilot!
41. I feel like it's all over the place.
42. This is the worst program. There is no sequence, lessons are just put together with no real explanation of skills needed before the lesson is presented. I am very bothered that I have to fill in the many gaps. Do not this program again, please!
43. There are great common core aligned lessons in the Open Source curriculum. However, due to the fact that the lessons are pulled from different resources, it lacks cohesiveness and appropriate sequencing for skills and concepts. In addition, the teacher's binder is <u>not</u> user-friendly. A lot of the lessons are wordy and unclear. It is very time consuming to read, to prepare/find materials (counters, dice, popsicle sticks, deck of cards, etc…), and adjust lessons to meet the needs of our students. In the student GEMS workbook, there is not enough practice of fundamental skills. We are spending a lot of time copying and supplementing to provide sufficient practice. The assessments do not have a variety of DOK leveled questions. Therefore, they are not very informative. We have had to supplement the assessments as well.

44. The approach to using "open source" in 5th grade is so scattered. The students are missing chunks of basic information. We need a logical, sequential, approach. I am spending a lot of time gathering supplemental material to fill in the gaps so that the students get the foundational skills they need. The GEMS books are a nice idea but not easy to follow.
45. The open source format is not always similar. I like to use more consistent material.
46. It's hard to implement the math program and I feel I'm having to do a lot more planning/researching/supplementing for this program. The lessons are "jumpy" and the HW does not seem to match the lesson, or the level of difficulty accelerates from easy to hard within a single assignment. For students who do not have the basic concepts to do the lesson (most of the students), there is no prelesson or modification (I need to find it and do it without the students).
47. There are great common core aligned lessons in the open source curriculum. However, due to the fact that the lessons are pulled from different resources, it lacks cohesiveness and appropriate sequencing for skills and concepts. In addition, the teacher's binder is not user friendly. A lot of the lessons are wordy and unclear. It is very time consuming to read, to prepare and find materials (e.g. popsicle sticks, dice, deck of cards, counters, …), and adjust lessons to the needs of our students. In the student GEMS workbook, there is not enough practice of fundamental skills. We are spending a lot of time supplementing and making copies to provide sufficient practice. The assessments don't have a variety of questions with different DOK levels. Therefore, they are not very informative. Again, we have spent a lot of time supplementing and creating additional questions for the assessment.
48. There is no consistency in the open source program. Things go from way too easy to too difficult with no reason making it extremely difficult to differentiate. Also, some lessons are just worksheets.
49. I have students learning to read. The language used is too difficult at the very beginning. There is no room for improvement. The material is above and beyond their understanding.
50. I'm grateful for the hard work, but it's lacking consistency.
51. We need curriculum not a bunch of different activities. We, they, need direct instruction. Many textbooks are set up that way. Explanation, example, guided, independent.
52. The open source is not building foundation skills for elementary students. This is tragic! Application should come about in middle school!
53. This whole "experiment" has been a disservice to children. A huge waste of time and resources. Haven't seen the math coach at all. What happened there?
54. Open source is a disservice to our students. The program provided (open source/GEMS) is not sequential, assumes students know all of the basics and assessments quizzes on concepts not contained in the instructional plan. Hit and miss and too much supplementing and every site/teacher/grade level doing something different = unprepared students.
55. It is very upsetting what our district has done with the math curriculum. It is unorganized, all over the place, and there is no content to it. I can look for material myself. I don't need a bunch of teachers who don't want to be in the classroom to do it for me. I don't know what is expected of me or what I need to teacher. I have a hard time finding homework.
56. Needs homework. Standards articulate outcome. Does not specify algorithms that must be used to demonstrate knowledge.
57. and the assessments don't match what I taught in the so-called "units". As a teacher and a parent, I am irate. Something needs to be done.
58. Program is disorganized. Materials provided are a haphazard collection of "downloaded" work that shows no deliberation on the part of the "creators".
59. There are not enough assessments. The program is disorganized. The skills/lessons do not build on one another. Need systematic lessons.
60. We can do much better than this! Please give us a well-written research based curriculum. We need help! Our students are not being given the best.
61. Hate it!

62. GEMS for my grade level in particular has been disorganized and confusing. Our grade level team has spent hours each week trying to make sense of the Teachers Edition, which had neither a clear LP format nor clear assessments that focused on what was taught in class.
63. The open source curriculum is not very well organized. I really like the concepts implemented, but they seem to be taught at random. There aren't very many assessments available, so I've had to create my own sometimes.
64. The current program offers NO guidance! We need answer keys, teachers edition page numbers need to correspond to student page numbers. There needs to be CLEAR, LARGE, examples of multiple problems. I could go on and on…..
65. Teacher manual is difficult to navigate. Not all GEMS pages have teacher support materials in teacher binder. Inconsistent lessons in GEMS.
66. The materials and lessons provided do no make the standards clear for my students. There is not enough practice for each standard. And the lessons are not worded the same as the assessments. Some assessment questions are never introduced in the lessons.
67. The GEMS produced have been useful but I need a more structured lesson to introduce the concepts with the GEMS to use as guided and independent practice.
68. This program is a waste of time, money, and energy.
69. What has the District done with the textbook money?
70. Please do NOT continue with open source.
71. Discontinue open source altogether.
72. This is bull$%&!.
73. There is no set up for complex topics, yet there is plenty (more than needed) time to review concepts covered in earlier grades. The answer key is almost always incorrect.
74. Open source is disjointed.
75. Extremely disjointed. Students are expected to make impossible leaps of understanding. Structured in a way that doesn't allow students to build upon and have a frame of reference. VOC on test often way above grade level and not covered in the VOC list.
76. It lacks scope and sequence.
77. I like some of the lessons, but nothing is cohesive. Because it's a patchwork, not all the pieces fit. I have to do additional work to make it fit, work I could be doing more productively with my class or on other subjects. I feel like I'm losing time.
78. So many problems with "open source". It's hurting students and teachers.
79. There is no spiral review with the book (GEMS). Lessons don't really go in order. Font too small for first grade (not a friendly book for a first grader!). Some standards are not listed on the lessons in the GEMS book.
80. This is a terrible way to teach students. It does not help them in any way.
81. I do find the Ready Common Core books to be useful.
82. I would also like to continue using Ready Common Core.
83. Reading the lessons requires a lot of time. There aren't a lot of practice materials and the scope/sequence is not very developmental for 7 year olds. The lessons are great, but we need planning time!
84. I use the GEMS materials as one resource, but I also use lots of other resources. I think GEMS in and of itself is not complete enough to use alone.
85. Prefer the structure and organization of a curriculum all laid out. Yet your training is most helpful.
86. GEMS planning guides are difficult to understand and curriculum is not in a logical order. Takes a very long time to get through lessons and students are not learning basic skills necessary to complete lessons.
87. I purchased many things that I want to use and continue to use so staying with open source is preferable.
88. I've had to purchase many of the "suggested" materials used in the lesson. The lessons do not blend together smoothly.

89. Even though I appreciate the math coach's hard work on the Open Source, I found there is no flow and consistency. Some lessons are hard to follow.
90. Open source jumps around too much. The lessons do not flow.
91. GEMS is all over the place. It's very difficult to follow and a very poor source for teaching such an important subject. We need professionally published curriculum…the sooner the better!
92. No more GEMS, please.
93. I want a published curriculum!
94. Open source is all over the place. It has no flow. Very hard to follow.
95. At this time, I like Ready/i-ready. It is standards aligned.
96. I like being able to add my own supplement, but this is more of a framework than a full curriculum with answer key, links to materials/resources and assessments attached.
97. The teacher materials are not user friendly. Lessons are not easy to follow. The teaching of the lessons is not clearly explained. Notes are small. Assessments are good but quizzes and mini-assessments are needed.
98. Need manipulatives.
99. Not helpful for special-ed students.
100. I would like to see more differentiation options for our SPED students.
101. There is no support for ELD or differentiation for students with special needs. Instruction doesn't match Tenmarks/Ready Common Core materials. We are confused with assessments that don't match the rubrics. One states to explain, test shows no space for explanation. Teachers don't agree with answers. Parents are confused.
102. The open source "curriculum" is confusing, not explained clearly, doesn't follow a clear path, has too many errors on it, and does not make me as a teacher see student progress.
103. The curriculum writers worked really hard but unfortunately it's not coming together. I think it was implemented too quickly.
104. I feel that the team has worked hard and what they have been done was implemented too quickly.
105. Not comprehensive; a curriculum is not just pulling things from Engage NY. There is no homework for kindergarten!
106. Program has no homework. Program?....is bits and pieces pulled from various sources. No differentiation. No proper structure. Not rigorous…common core. Each educator has to find own sources to meet the needs of student almost make own program. Need consistent stable program across the district.
107. The materials do no have a natural flow. The teaching style/worksheets are not a match for my classroom. This has become something I feel I have to do to give feedback, but it is not enhancing my math instruction and has become a nuisance.
108. Frustration #1: Gems does not provide instruction in a logical way. The fractions unit begins with a lesson on equivalent fractions. In the past, EDM provided a lesson or two to review the basic concepts students must master first before tackling equivalent fractions. The Ready Common Core workbook provides a better description and introduction of concepts. The visual models are more appealing and provide a better explanation of concepts and problem solving techniques. Frustration #2: Benchmark assessments are very time consuming and complicated. Students get frustrated and overwhelmed. If often break it into 2-3 days. There is little room to show the work. Students need extra scratch paper to show all the work. Frustration #3: There is no answer key or rubric to grade the benchmark assessments in a consistent manner. At our last district training day, teachers left even more confused because no guidance was given to create a consistent way to grade district wide.
109. We need professionals writing our curriculum.
110. Not every teacher has the time or the ability to find the right materials for a given standard. Guidelines and designated textbooks are essential to steer the courses/subject matters in the right direction. It's not enough to say, "Go teach the following standards…go find resources wherever you can." This is very irresponsible way of conducting programs and schools by the District.

111. I feel open source curriculum has been more of a supplemental program.
112. GEMS works best as a supplement.
113. I'm a writer/Learning Leader!
114. The assessments don't appear to always match the emphasis given certain areas in the unit activities. I appreciate the hard work teacher leaders have been charged with, and some of the activities are appropriate, engaging, and instructive. But as a whole, I am spending a lot of time filling in the gaps by going to other sources looking for cohesive threads and for supplemental practice of which there is very little in the GEMS. I would like to see what a published program looks like. It feels like hit and miss sometimes for me., the teachers, as well as for the students.
115. Don't call it a curriculum!We need a published, tested, authentic math curriculum. I'm tired of having to supplement for the bad GEMS that are supposed to be our district Math program. We also need the District to purchase manipulatives. 10 Frames, Rekenreks, 3 d shapes.
116. We need manipulatives the lessons talk about doing. Pages need to be perforated for easy checking/correcting. I still need to supplement for ELD/low kids. Gems is confusing because there are minor format mistakes. The lesson directions should be written in a lesson plan format for easy and quick understanding. There is too much of the same which makes it hard to follow accurate time frame. I'd like quicker links to videos to use in class for demonstrations (list maybe?). Some of the word problems are so deep and revolve around multiple steps with multiple parts, the kids are dying. Across the board, kids can do work with whole class, partner, small group, but cannot do independently.
117. The open source curriculum, combined with the i-Ready common core booklets, does not provide a well thought out flow and progression of lessons. Teachers are spending inefficient amounts of time making sense of the standards in terms of how they will teach them and present them form those materials. In combination with lack of well though out materials for language arts, the curriculum development burden is quite unmanageable and unrealistic. Add to that the expectations for "universal design" implementation. Seriously, are teachers supposed to do EVERYTHING?
118. Then open source curriculum has no rhyme or reason. The skills are not sequentially taught and do not have sufficient practice. I am very unhappy with the direction our District has gone with math. I fear our test scores will plummet, since everyone is scrambling to find materials. We have had no support from the District. No increased supply budget for paper, printer ink, or manipulatives. Many of the ideas are highly impractical for our huge class sizes of nearly 40, students with mainstreamed special ed, unidentified special needs students, and ELL learners. The prep time I am spending to design my own math program is exhausting and requiring me to spend precious time at the photocopy machine. With large staff numbers plus parents using these machines, they are constantly breaking down. Long queues are a daily reality. In desperation, I purchased a 5th grade text, Envision Math Common Core by Pearson to use as a guide. We are doing a huge disservice to our students and community and causing teacher burn out by not adopting a formal math program that has been approved.
119. It is costing me $50-$100 a month to buy outside the "open source" program. This includes the manipulatives that are needed but not provided by the District.
120. It is costing me too much money to support this program. I amhaving to spend countless hours searching for materials.
121. We do not have the manipulatives we need. Assessments are not provided or if they are, they are bad. It doesn't flow. I want a book. My students need a real curriculum, not random sheets downloaded from the internet.
122. Please help! The California State Board of Ed. Has a variety of Math CCSS approved textbooks. See website. Thanks for all you do!
123. Spiral bound is better. Not enough time considering we have i-Ready books also. Too much info at once. Copies are lengthy.
124. Can we incorporate i-ready into curriculum?
125. Coordination between GEMS and i-Ready books is lacking.

126. I want direct and easy access to online sample lessons for my students. I'd like to have copies made of key lessons and their masters for the homework to choose what my students need.
127. Need more quizzes to measure and assess progress.
128. Open source has too many gaps that don't sequence in a comprehensive way to implement to students. All over the place!!!
129. I know many teachers are working hard to develop curriculum but their hands are "tied" by "superiors". We need to get really good materials in the classroom.
130. I have deep admiration for my colleagues who have taken on positions as math coaches and curriculum writers. Unfortunately, they have been hung out to dry by the GUSD administration. If had been asked about this idea beforehand, we would have easily predicted the current problems. The curriculum/lessons are clumsy. In fact, there aren't real lessons, but bits and pieces we are left to try to bring together for our students. The standards, lessons, and assessments don't match up well. At least I don't think they do, as it's really unclear as to where we're supposed to be heading. Receiving units late and one at a time does not allow for long range planning. The District's claim that there are no appropriate programs out there is disingenuous. Other Districts are adopting programs. If the best of these doesn't completely meet Common Core standards, we should adopt it and THEN supplement with open source materials.
131. Thank you for all your hard work. This program does not work. It is too hard for the students.
132. We need to pilot something available in Spanish. Right now in 3rd grade dual we are downloading and printing Engage NY materials, which are Open Source, but well-done and available in Spanish.
133. Whatever we pilot must be available in Spanish. Third grade has used Engage New York (in Spanish).
134. First of all, they are not Spanish. Lessons seem to be out of order. There is a lot of going back and forth. Lessons are taking too long to complete.
135. It's challenging and time consuming to translate the worksheets to Korean. We would appreciate translated worksheets to use in the classroom.
136. Translations for FLAG programs are so behind…I received unit 2 when my EO colleagues had already begun unit 3.
137. It would be nice to have teacher answer sheets. Also would be helpful to have quizzes and not just long end of unit. Where are translated TE and tests?
138. It's confusing for all parties involved. Save money spent on printing open source and provide teachers/grade levels money to supplement. Teachers pay teachers/teaching workbooks.
139. Make copies for teachers of assessments. We are on a limit. The games are irrelevant.
140. Too wordy, not enough time to figure out lessons in Districts Open Source materials.
141. Please bring back the SWUN program.
142. Return to SWUN.
143. SWUN.
144. Go back to SWUN.
145. We like SWUN at our school. Very effective program.
146. I thought SWUN was very effective and in progress with CCSS alignment. I would like to go back to this.
147. Or Swun, using open source as a supplement. Open source has made it very difficult to prepare. It takes too long to read/interpret lessons.
148. Using common core aligned curriculum would be helpful for teaching more in depth strategies. Feel like we are needing to go through curriculum so we don't' get behind and the core facts/strategies are not as well taught.
149. I know that the "curriculum" of open source materials needs improvements before next school year but am confident that it meets the common core standards better than expensive textbook adoptions that are labeled "common core aligned".
150. GEMS doesn't cover all the materials students need to learn for the year (a lot of holes). Jumps from one concept to the next.

151. I have used the open source but not exclusively. It has some very good things. I think it would be a helpful supplement.
152. The idea behind open source GEMS is great! Ease if use is not good at all. Intent is good, but seems "piece meal".
153. It is evident that there was a lot of work and effort put into creating the open source "curriculum". However, I do not feel it was a curriculum. It seemed to be a group of various lessons that were put together. It is lacking lesson design, continuity, organization, explanation, and appropriate assessment.
154. While I appreciate the intent of and efforts of the Math, especially support of coach _____, this is piecemeal and lacks some parts of all the lessons. Very user unfriendly. Lacks ALL manipulatives, which is crazy. (Has ideas about how we can make our own…with what?) Pilot new Everyday Math, which is fully aligned with Common Core and also provides teach integration, must provide student online subscriptions so that students/parents can access ALL parts at home as well as school. Fidelity to the program!
155. I appreciate the efforts of the curriculum writers, but there are huge gaps in what's been created, or "compiled from Google", and they are not professional curriculum writers. I find myself planning and creating materials daily to meet the needs of my students. I need a curriculum and the teachers can create the supplemental materials to address what may be lacking. It's exhausting and frustrating. I am also concerned there is no curriculum expert leading the curriculum writers in the daunting task.
156. District teachers have worked hard to pull together lessons but they are not curriculum writers. Lessons are disconnected and lack logical flow. Units are too long. Assessments are not balanced to the number of lessons per standard. Teachers are having to supplement excessively to adequately teach the standards.
157. Lessons are out of place or do not build on each other. Random concepts appear in units without prior lessons that have reviewed or taught the concept. No progressions (easy, medium, challenging) of concepts. Lessons and units are copied and pasted without thought, purpose, or consideration for the student and the teacher. The program is created by teachers who have no knowledge (Education) of Math and how a curriculum should be written. The program makes our lives more challenging and more stressful. Why are we asked to teach a program that is not effective, when we have access to "ready Common Core" journal that is written by professional curriculum writers who have doctorate degrees in Mathematics. The GEMS program has got to go.
158. We need more nonfiction books for our school library in order to better support our curriculum.
159. I truly appreciate the hard work, dedication, and positive attitude of our District Math team!
160. I think this can be effective if people buy into it and give it a shot.
161. Excellent support from the math hs. All the trainings are worthwhile and can be used in the classroom the following day.
162. The curriculum writers and coaches work really hard to get the materials to us. There is no CCSS aligned math curriculum that is solid enough to pilot. Unfortunately, the I've looked at them and read aggregated research.
163. I need to supplement with "manipulatives". I appreciate our "Math Coaches". They have demonstrated lessons, observed and participated. They are available for assistance when needed.
164. Thank you for working so hard on the Open Source curriculum. Some activities are quite good while others no so. Assessment pieces are good! The sequence of curriculum lacking. Some lessons not kid friendly nor teacher friendly.
165. Thanks for asking!
166. I know it's a work in progress. I am able to use it.