

Memorandum

To: Cynthia McCarty, Alabama STEM Council, Acting Director
Elizabeth Mohr, Alabama STEM Council, STEM Project Support

From: Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)

Date: July 30, 2026

Re: ANA Evaluation Quarterly Memo

HumRRO's evaluation examines the extent to which the Alabama Numeracy Act (ANA) is being implemented as intended and whether implementation is producing the desired outcomes for students in grades K–5. The evaluation includes process and outcome components as well as eight supplemental studies. This memo provides a status of activities completed from January through June 2026. Findings presented in this memo are preliminary and drawn from the Year 4 annual stakeholder survey and in-person and virtual focus groups. Final results, along with recommendations, will be presented in the annual report disseminated in January 2027.

Interim Findings

ANA Priorities

Findings from the annual survey indicate that most responding stakeholders reported implementing key tasks related to several ANA priority requirements:

- 60 minutes a day of Tier 1 math instruction
 - **93.8%** of responding **K–5 teachers** reported providing an average of 60 minutes of Tier 1 math instruction per day.
- Elementary Mathematics Task Force (EMTF)-approved core math curricula
 - **58.0%** of responding **K–5 teachers** reported using only EMTF-approved math curricula and quality print and online resources.
 - **77.4%** of responding **full-support (FS) school principals** and **81.0%** of responding **limited-support (LS) school principals** reported using EMTF-approved math curricula for core instruction.
 - **87.4%** of responding **math coaches** reported using only EMTF-approved math curricula and high-quality print and online resources; **100%** reported collaborating with math teachers and grade-level teams to foster use of appropriate instructional materials.
 - **95.5%** of responding **regional coordinators** reported supporting implementation of EMTF-approved core math curricula and intervention programs; **90.9%** reported monitoring implementation.
- EMTF-approved math formative benchmark, screening, and diagnostic assessments
 - Formative benchmark assessments
 - **67.7%** of responding **FS school principals** and **83.3%** of **LS school principals** reported using EMTF-approved formative, screening, and diagnostic assessments.

- Screening assessments
 - **52.1%** of responding **K–5 teachers** reported using only an EMTF-approved screening assessment to screen K–5 students.
 - **71.0%** of responding **FS school principals** and **82.1%** of responding **LS school principals** reported ensuring their school uses an EMTF-approved screening assessment to identify students who may be at risk for poor math outcomes.
 - **93.7%** of responding **math coaches** reported assisting teachers in administering EMTF-approved fractional reasoning screeners or diagnostic assessments to 4th and 5th grade students.
 - **91.3%** of responding **math coaches** reported assisting teachers in administering EMTF-approved early numeracy screeners or diagnostic assessments to grades K–2 students.
 - **96.1%** of responding **math coaches** reported using only an EMTF-approved screening assessment to screen K–5 students.
 - **92.3%** of responding **local education agency (LEA) staff** reported that kindergarten students are assessed by November using an EMTF-approved early numeracy screening assessment.
 - **89.7%** of responding **LEA staff** reported that incoming 1st and 2nd grade students are assessed using an EMTF-approved early numeracy screening assessment a minimum of two times per year.
 - **94.9%** responding **LEA staff** reported that incoming 4th and 5th grade students are assessed using an EMTF-approved fractional reasoning screener a minimum of two times per year.
- Diagnostic assessments
 - **54.4%** of responding **K–5 teachers** reported using an EMTF-approved diagnostic screening assessment to assess K–5 students identified with a math deficiency.
 - **67.7%** of responding **FS school principals** and **83.3%** of responding **LS school principals** reported using EMTF-approved formative assessments, screeners, and diagnostic assessments.
 - **95.3%** of responding **math coaches** reported using an EMTF-approved diagnostic assessment to assess K–5 students identified with a math deficiency.
 - **97.4%** of responding **LEA staff** reported that kindergarten students identified by the screener as having a math deficiency are assessed using an EMTF-approved diagnostic assessment.
 - **87.2%** of responding **LEA staff** reported that 1st and 2nd grade students identified by the screener as having a math deficiency are assessed using the EMTF-approved diagnostic assessment.
- EMTF- recommended intensive, immediate interventions
 - **60.3%** of responding **K–5 teachers** reported providing intensive, immediate EMTF-approved interventions to K–5 students identified with a math deficiency.
 - **89.7%** of responding **LEA staff** reported that K–5 students identified with a math deficiency are provided EMTF-approved intensive math interventions to address their specific needs.

- Alabama Evidence-Based Coaching Accountability System (EBCAS)
 - The State Superintendent of Education, the Office of Mathematics Improvement (OMI), and the EMTF are developing the EBCAS to measure the effectiveness of math coaches.
 - OMI established the following EBCAS implementation timeline:
 - SY2025–26: Develop EBCAS framework and materials
 - SY2026–27: Pilot test the EBCAS Professional Learning Plan (PLP)
 - SY2027–28: Statewide implementation of the EBCAS PLP for all math coaches
 - SY2028–29: Full statewide implementation of the EBCAS (PLP and evidence-based evaluation process) for all math coaches
- EMTF-approved curricula for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction and approved intervention plans
 - **71.0%** of responding **FS school principals** and **85.7%** of responding **LS school principals** reported using EMTF-approved math intervention programs or curricula for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.
 - **92.3%** of responding **LEA staff** reported K–5 students receive math intervention services and supports to improve any identified area of math deficiency.
- Alabama Math Summer Achievement Program
 - **74.2%** of responding **FS school principals** reported providing the Alabama Math Summer Achievement Program to all 4th and 5th grade students identified with a math deficiency.
 - **58.1%** reported including not less than 40 hours nor more than 70 hours of time spent in math problem solving.
 - **61.3%** reported administering an EMTF-recommended math assessment both at the beginning and end of the program to measure student progress.
 - **94.9%** of responding **LEA staff** reported providing a summer math camp for students in grades K–5 who are identified with a math deficiency.
 - **95.5%** of responding **regional coordinators** reported monitoring implementation of the Alabama Summer Math Achievement Program.

Notable ANA Implementation Gaps

There are some notable implementation gaps for some stakeholder groups:

- K–5 teachers
 - Only about 52%–58% reported
 - Using only EMTF-approved math curricula and quality print and online resources.
 - Using only EMTF-approved screening assessments to screen K–5 students.
 - Using an EMTF-approved diagnostic assessment to assess students identified with a math deficiency.
 - Avoiding practices that minimize sense-making and conceptual understanding.
- FS School Principals
 - Only about **58%** reported including the required 40–70 hours of math problem solving in the Alabama Summer Achievement Program.
 - Only about **68%** reported using EMTF-approved formative assessments, screeners, and diagnostic assessments as intended.

Perceived Barriers to ANA Implementation

Responding stakeholders across groups identified several factors they perceive as preventing them or others from implementing the ANA effectively:

- ***K–5 teachers: About one-third*** cited the lack of available time is a barrier to effective ANA implementation.
- ***FS and LS school principals: Approximately one-third*** identified teachers' lack of familiarity with state math content standards and their inability to align instruction to the standards' rigor as key barriers.
- ***Math coaches: About half*** cited teachers' lack of familiarity with state math content standards; ***slightly fewer than half*** cited teachers' inability to align instruction to those standards.
- ***LEA staff: Slightly fewer than half*** indicated that simultaneously implementing multiple required initiatives is a barrier; ***approximately one-third*** cited challenges with onboarding new math teachers, lack of teacher buy-in, and teachers' inability to align instruction with state math content standards.
- ***Regional coordinators: Approximately two-thirds*** cited lack of teacher buy-in and insufficient district-level infrastructure are barriers.

Focus Group Preliminary Findings

HumRRO conducted in-person focus groups with parents (n = 19) and students (n = 63) at three FS and three LS schools in March 2026. Virtual focus groups were conducted with Alabama Math, Science, and Technology Initiative (AMSTI) staff (n = 3), regional coordinators (n = 24), LEA staff (n = 14), FS and LS school principals (n = 14), math coaches (n = 28), and K–5 teachers (n = 11) between March and May 2026. Key preliminary findings by stakeholder group are summarized below.

AMSTI Staff

- AMSTI training was historically voluntary; under the ANA, prescribed training is now required, with AMSTI responsible for delivery and OMI responsible for tracking completion.
- AMSTI has been unable to proportionally increase staff to meet the growing number of schools requiring services.
- A shortage of certified teachers has contributed to a limited culture of learning in some schools, a challenge that must be addressed before ANA instructional priorities can be fully realized.

Regional Coordinators

- Insufficient foundational instruction at the K–2 level has created compounding math knowledge content and skill gaps for students in grades 3–5.
- Monthly monitoring forms and Depth of Implementation (DOI) visits have been effective tools; however, regional coordinators lack accountability authority when administrators do not act on feedback.

LEA Staff

- High turnover and hiring non-certified teachers may underlie teachers' limited familiarity with certain math content standards (e.g., fractions) and their difficulty aligning instruction to those standards.

FS and LS School Principals

- Principals regard math coaches highly, noting their effectiveness in modeling lessons and supporting collaborative planning.
- Principals rely on informal methods to evaluate their math coaches (e.g., weekly meetings, teacher feedback, monitoring observations) and noted that the state is developing a new evaluation tool better suited for math coaches.
- Principals observed teachers struggling with both math content knowledge and aligning instruction to the rigor demanded by state standards.

Math Coaches

- Time constraints remain a significant challenge, particularly for debriefs and professional development without encroaching on teachers' planning time.
- Coaches expressed interest in being certified to deliver training in-house (e.g., OGAP) so they can better support teachers.
- Coaches identified a need for clearer guidance on entering documentation into Monday.com.

K–5 Teachers

- Teachers would like training on vertical progression across grade levels to identify and fill gaps for below-level students.
- The most challenging standards for teachers include those involving fractions, select multiplication standards (e.g., comparisons and scaling), and word problems.
- The most effective instructional strategies for building students' math knowledge include student discourse (e.g., turn-and-talk), use of manipulatives, number sense routines, and building conceptual understanding.
- Teachers at large schools expressed a need for additional math coaches and interventionists.

Parents

- Most parents have not heard of the ANA; however, many reported noticing changes in their children's math education, including increased emphasis on math, the presence of math coaches, hands-on learning activities, and increased student engagement.
- Parents receive feedback on student progress through report cards, progress reports, digital platforms (e.g., ClassDojo, PowerSchool), and i-Ready diagnostic reports, though the frequency and personalization of communication varies considerably by teacher.

Students

- Students' favorite tools include base ten blocks, number lines, and fraction tiles.
- Students enjoy various math activities such as i-Ready, Kahoot, Frax, number talks, math stations, and group work.

- Number lines and rulers were cited as frustrating tools due to difficulty reading them and drawing evenly.
- Several students expressed frustration with classroom noise and distractions.
- Most students reported having at least one family member who discusses math with them; some noted that parents struggle with “new math” methods or language barriers that limit their ability to help.

Status of Evaluation Studies

Outcome Evaluation

HumRRO awaits receipt of the SY2025–26 outcome data from the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE). These data are expected in September 2026. Upon receipt, we will clean, process, and analyze the data.

Alabama Multi-Tiered System of Supports (AL-MTSS) Study

The AL-MTSS study examines the extent to which (a) the Alabama Framework for MTSS is being implemented in grades K–5 and (b) ratings of MTSS implementation within schools relate to the distribution of students within tiered placements. Data were collected through targeted school leader interviews, administrative records, the annual survey, and focus groups.

- Key findings from FS and LS school leader interviews (n = 9):
 - Schools follow a consistent MTSS process to examine student data, provide appropriate instruction and interventions, and monitor progress, indicating fidelity to the MTSS framework.
 - ANA requirements have strengthened MTSS implementation, supported by increased training from math coaches and regional coordinators.
 - Improved MTSS procedures have resulted in a clearer understanding of math progression and student needs.
 - School staff have difficulty finding sufficient time to implement all components of MTSS with fidelity, especially documentation requirements.
 - MTSS implementation may be improved further by providing clear and consistent implementation guidance and streamlined documentation requirements.
- Key findings from additional analyses of SY2024–25 tiered-placement data:
 - More than half (52%) of students receiving a Tier 3 intervention scored in the lowest performance level on the 2024–25 math ACAP assessment, compared to only 17% of students not receiving a Tier 3 intervention.
 - The share of students receiving Tier 3 math interventions was highest in grades 2–5 (14%–16% of students in FS and LS schools), compared to 10% or less in kindergarten and grade 1.

- EMTF-approved Do The Math (56%) and i-Ready (42%) were the most common Tier 3 intervention tools.¹ Findings from MTSS interviews corroborate this finding.
- The length of Tier 3 intervention varied considerably: 25% of students received intervention for 9 weeks or less; 38% for more than 9 weeks through one semester; 27% for more than one semester through three 9-week periods; and 9% for more than three 9-week periods.
- Key findings from the Year 4 annual survey:
 - **72%** of responding **K–5 teachers** reported providing reports to parents/legal guardians that detail the strengths, deficiencies, and progress of students who received math intervention during the school year.
 - **87.1%** of responding **FS school principals** and **91.7%** of **LS school principals** reported that their school has structures in place to support MTSS implementation.
 - **93.5%** of responding **FS school principals** and **91.7%** of **LS school principals** reported that their school makes data-based decisions about instruction, placement, and resource allocation.
 - **90.3%** of responding **FS school principals** and **94.0%** of **LS school principals** reported implementing MTSS to monitor student progress and improve instructional decisions.
 - **90.9%** of responding **regional coordinators** reported supporting MTSS implementation, and **81.8%** reported monitoring implementation.
- Key findings from the stakeholder spring virtual focus groups include:
 - **FS and LS school principals** consistently described time constraints as a primary barrier to effective MTSS implementation.
 - **K–5 teachers** cited chronic student absenteeism, students being pulled from Tier 1 instruction for special education or related services, a wide range of student ability levels, and unrealistic growth expectations for some students as challenges to MTSS implementation.

Comparison Study

The comparison study uses quasi-experimental design (QED) procedures to assess the impact of math coaches on student math performance in FS and LS schools. For SY2024–25, HumRRO identified a sufficient number of schools without a math coach to serve as a matched comparison group. However, as Alabama continues to expand math coach assignments statewide, it may be difficult to identify a sufficient number of SY2025–26 comparison schools.

Upon receipt of final SY2025–26 outcome data and school designations, HumRRO will explore design options that will allow for an appropriate and accurate examination of math coach impact on student math performance.

¹ EMTF-approved intervention resources (Tier 3) include Curriculum Associates' i-Ready Toolbox + Personalized Instruction; Heinemann's Do the Math; McGraw Hill's Number Worlds; Teacher Created Materials' Focused Mathematics Intervention; and Zearn Math.

Cost Effectiveness Analysis Study

The cost effectiveness analysis study examines the overall costs and actual or anticipated benefit of investing in the ANA for student math achievement. The study team continued to collect and verify SY2024–25 and SY2025–26 cost data and to refine cost categories and totals during this reporting period.

Math Coach Study

The math coach study examines the relationship between principals' and regional coordinators' math coach evaluations and differences in student math achievement. For SY2024–25, HumRRO used proficiency levels established during May stakeholder review meetings to examine this relationship and found that after accounting for SY2023–24 school-level math performance, SY2024–25 coach proficiency level had no meaningful impact on student achievement outcomes. However, given that a large proportion of SY2024–25 FS and LS schools were either in their first year with a coach or rated at the Emerging level, it is likely too early to draw conclusions about the impact of coach proficiency on student achievement.

During SY2025–26, ALSDE and OMI developed a new coach accountability framework scheduled for piloting in fall 2026. Because the new framework remained under development, SY2025–26 coach proficiency ratings were not collected. As a result, the SY2025–26 math coach study will focus on available coach implementation metrics and coach characteristics rather than proficiency ratings. Analysis plans will be finalized upon receipt of SY2025–26 outcome data.

Screening Assessments Study

The screening assessments study examines the extent to which required screening assessments accurately identify students who subsequently receive tiered services or a diagnosis related to a math deficiency.²

- Key findings from the stakeholder spring virtual focus groups:
 - **Regional coordinators** reported that use of early numeracy screening data varies considerably by school, district, leadership, and screening platform. Some schools use screening results to inform tiered instruction; others administer assessments primarily as a compliance exercise. High staff turnover, staff feeling overwhelmed, and competing initiatives were cited as contributing factors.
 - **LEA staff** described consistent processes for using screening data to assign students to tiered instruction and noted that early numeracy and fractional reasoning screening tools support productive teacher conversations about standards-aligned instruction.
 - **FS and LS school principals** cited the time required for screening assessment administration, particularly one-on-one assessments, as a significant challenge. Principals also expressed a need for additional training on proper administration and data entry. Math coaches were identified as a key resource for analyzing and acting on screening data.
 - **Math coaches** noted that because districts may use either the i-Ready or Forefront screening assessments, the process for assigning students to tiered instruction based on screening data is not standardized across schools. Key challenges include

² Alabama's EMTF-approved early numeracy screening assessments include Curriculum Associates' i-Ready Diagnostic and Interview Tool and Forefront's K–2 Numeracy Screener. Alabama's only EMTF-approved fractional reasoning screening assessment is Forefront's Fractional Reasoning Screener.

administration time, inconsistencies in data recording and platform limitations, and variations in guidance for interpreting and acting on results.

- **K–5 teachers** reported conducting one-on-one screening administration with students or having an interventionist or coach do so. Teachers noted they often need a substitute teacher in order to attend screening administration training and conduct one-on-one assessments.

Stakeholder Awareness & Satisfaction Study

The awareness and satisfaction study examines the extent to which stakeholders are aware of and satisfied with ANA implementation. Satisfaction rates were high across all responding stakeholder groups, with at least 89% of each group reporting they are at least somewhat satisfied with ANA implementation.³

Stakeholder Group	% At Least Somewhat Satisfied
LS School Principals	96.5%
LEA Staff	94.9%
Math Coaches	93.7%
Regional Coordinators	91.0%
FS School Principals	90.3%
K–5 Teachers	89.1%

Teacher Math Knowledge and Pedagogy Study

The teacher math knowledge and pedagogy study examines the status of and changes in K–5 teachers’ math content knowledge and pedagogical skills over time. We administer the online Mathematics for Teaching Tool (MTT) annually; the next administration is scheduled for September 2026.⁴ The MTT includes items specific to math content and instructional methods and is designed to measure change in aggregate performance over time. We analyzed data from the MTT and annual survey data to assess ratings and changes in teachers’ math knowledge and pedagogical skills.

- Analysis of MTT data did not find evidence of changes in teachers’ math content knowledge or pedagogy (see Year 3 annual report). Alternate scoring methods produced similar results.
- Despite these findings, **87% of FS school principals** and **80% of LS school principals** reported that the ANA has improved their teachers’ math knowledge and pedagogical skills at least somewhat. Principals’ perceptions may reflect observed changes in instructional practices not fully captured by the MTT.

³ Satisfaction rates are based on responses to the Year 4 annual survey.

⁴ Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(5), 389-407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108324554>. We administer the MTT to all K–5 elementary math teachers; 792 teachers participated in fall 2024 and 1,024 in fall 2025.

Unintended Consequences Study

This study examines the unintended positive and negative outcomes that have emerged from implementing the ANA.⁵

- Positive outcomes reported by stakeholders:
 - ***K–5 teachers*** reported improved student learning outcomes, increased student engagement, and greater self-confidence in their instructional practices. Teachers expressed strong appreciation for math coaches, identifying lesson modeling and individualized feedback as the most helpful supports coaches provide.
 - ***FS and LS school principals*** cited increased teacher math knowledge, confidence, and buy-in as key positive outcomes.
 - ***Math coaches*** observed improved instructional practices and increased teacher knowledge, confidence, and buy-in. Coaches also noted that ANA provides a clear framework for working with teachers, and that teachers are increasingly using evidence-based approaches.
 - ***LEA staff*** reported improved instructional practices, increased student math achievement, noticeable impact from math coaching, enhanced teacher confidence, a positive shift from procedural to conceptual teaching, and improved professional development for coaches.
 - ***Regional coordinators*** noted improved instructional practices, more dedicated time for math instruction, implementation of tiered supports, increased math-focused professional development, data-driven discussions in Professional Learning Community meetings, and growing administrator understanding of quality math instruction.
- Negative outcomes reported by stakeholders:
 - ***K–5 teachers*** cited increased workload, stress, and time constraints as negative outcomes of ANA implementation.
 - ***FS and LS school principals*** reported increased teacher stress and overwhelm as the primary negative outcome, along with the demands of implementing competing initiatives and the time required to effectively monitor instruction.
 - ***Math coaches*** identified increased teacher overwhelm and insufficient time to implement all ANA requirements effectively as the primary negative outcomes.
 - ***LEA staff*** identified documentation and reporting burdens and coaching model challenges as negative outcomes.
 - ***Regional coordinators*** cited inconsistent or surface-level ANA implementation, staff overwhelm from competing initiatives, and lack of role clarity as the primary negative outcomes.

Remaining FY2026 Evaluation Activities

Attachment A presents the planned Year 4 general, process, and outcome evaluation activities and Attachment B presents the planned Year 4 supplemental studies activities.

⁵ Positive and negative outcomes are those reported by stakeholders on the Year 4 annual survey.

Attachment A: Planned Year 4 General, Process, and Outcome ANA Evaluation Activities⁶

Year 4 Timing	General Evaluation Activities	Process Evaluation Activities	Outcome Evaluation Activities
Jan – Mar 2026	Weekly meetings with OMI/ALSDE Biweekly supplemental study meetings with OMI/ALSDE Monthly meetings with STEM Council Executive Director Monthly HumRRO-Mathematica team meetings Refine/Update ANA evaluation data tracking system Finalize Year 3 annual report Disseminate Year 3 annual report (March 30, 2026) to designated individuals	Prepare process evaluation section of Year 3 annual report Refine Year 4 annual survey to measure quality/effectiveness of ANA implementation processes and activities; survey to include parallel versions for specific stakeholder groups (regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, FS/LS principals, math coaches, FS/LS K–5 teachers) Work with OMI/ALSDE to whitelist Year 4 annual survey URL in FS and LS schools Administer Year 4 annual survey to five major stakeholder groups (regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, FS/LS principals, math coaches, FS/LS K–5 teachers) Refine protocols for parent and student focus groups (FGs) Plan/schedule spring 2026 in-person FGs with parents and students Conduct in-person FGs with parents and students in 3 FS schools and 3 LS schools Refine protocols for conducting spring 2026 virtual FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches; sessions will elaborate on and/or clarify survey findings	Clean and merge SY2024–25 student, teacher, and school outcome datasets; review quality of data for meeting assumptions of proposed analyses (e.g., normality, linearity) Conduct analyses of SY2024–25 outcome data, separately by metric as appropriate Prepare description of SY2024–25 outcome findings (narrative and tables) Prepare outcome evaluation section of Year 3 annual report

⁶ Shaded text indicates completed activities.

Year 4 Timing	General Evaluation Activities	Process Evaluation Activities	Outcome Evaluation Activities
		Plan/schedule spring 2026 virtual FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches Begin conducting spring 2026 virtual FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches	
Apr – June 2026	Weekly meetings with OMI/ALSDE Biweekly supplemental study meetings with OMI/ALSDE Monthly meetings with STEM Council Executive Director Monthly HumRRO-Mathematica team meetings Refine/Update ANA evaluation data tracking system	Clean Year 4 annual survey data Analyze Year 4 annual survey data separately by stakeholder type Prepare description of Year 4 survey findings (narrative, tables) Complete conducting spring 2026 virtual FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches Refine protocols for spring 2026 virtual FGs with FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers; sessions to elaborate on and/or clarify survey findings Plan/schedule spring 2026 virtual FGs with FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers Conduct spring 2026 virtual FGs with FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers Analyze spring 2026 parent and student in-person FG data separately by stakeholder type Analyze spring 2026 regional coordinator, district staff, and math coach virtual FG data separately by stakeholder type	Check with ALSDE periodically regarding status of SY2025–26 outcome data

Year 4 Timing	General Evaluation Activities	Process Evaluation Activities	Outcome Evaluation Activities
July – Sept 2026	Weekly meetings with OMI/ALSDE Biweekly supplemental study meetings with OMI/ALSDE Monthly meetings with STEM Council Executive Director Monthly HumRRO-Mathematica team meetings Refine/Update ANA evaluation data tracking system	Analyze spring 2026 FS/LS principal and FS/LS K–5 teacher virtual FG data separately by stakeholder type Prepare description of parent and student spring 2026 FG findings (narrative, tables) Prepare description of regional coordinator, district staff, and math coach spring 2026 FG findings (narrative, tables) Prepare description of FS/LS principal and FS/LS K–5 teacher spring 2026 FG findings (narrative, tables)	Finalize procedures for receipt of SY2025–26 outcome data Work with ALSDE to receive SY2025–26 outcome data
Oct – Dec 2026	Weekly meetings with OMI/ALSDE Biweekly supplemental study meetings with OMI/ALSDE Monthly meetings with STEM Council Executive Director Monthly HumRRO-Mathematica team meetings Refine/Update ANA evaluation data tracking system Prepare Year 4 annual report; disseminate January 30, 2027	Prepare process evaluation section of Year 4 annual report	Clean and merge SY2025-26 student, teacher, and school outcome datasets Conduct analyses of SY2025–26 outcome data, separately by metric as appropriate Prepare description of SY2025–26 outcome findings (narrative and data visualization/tables); include trends across years as appropriate Prepare outcome evaluation section of Year 4 annual report

Attachment B: Year 4 Planned ANA Supplemental Studies Activities⁷

Year 4 Timing	Math Coach Evaluation and Student Math Achievement	MTSS and Student Math Achievement	Teacher Math Knowledge/Pedagogy and Student Math Achievement
Jan – Mar 2026	Prepare math coach study section of Year 3 annual report	Prepare MTSS section of Year 3 annual report Draft and finalize MTSS questions for Year 4 annual survey Finalize MTSS interview protocol and conduct outreach to select school leaders using principal contact information from OMI-identified schools Review and analyze AIR needs assessment, tiered intervention, survey, and student achievement data; prepare description of findings (narrative and tables) Begin conducting MTSS interviews with select school leaders Draft and finalize MTSS questions for spring 2026 FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, math coaches, FS/LS principals, and FS/LS K–5 teachers Discuss MTSS questions during spring 2026 virtual FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches	Prepare teacher math knowledge/pedagogy section of Year 3 annual report Draft and finalize teacher math knowledge/pedagogy questions for Year 4 annual survey Draft and finalize teacher math knowledge/pedagogy questions for spring 2026 FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, math coaches, FS/LS principals, and FS/LS K–5 teachers Discuss teacher math knowledge/pedagogy questions during spring 2026 virtual FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches

⁷ Shaded text indicates completed activities.

Year 4 Timing	Math Coach Evaluation and Student Math Achievement	MTSS and Student Math Achievement	Teacher Math Knowledge/Pedagogy and Student Math Achievement
Apr – June 2026	Work with ALSDE/OMI to receive SY2025–26 school math coach and individual math coach performance data ⁸	Complete MTSS interviews with select school leaders Analyze MTSS interview data and share preliminary findings; prepare narrative description of findings Analyze tiered intervention data; prepare description of findings (narrative and tables) Discuss MTSS questions during spring 2026 virtual FGs with FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers	Discuss teacher math knowledge/pedagogy questions during spring 2026 virtual FGs with FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers
July – Sept 2026	Receive and clean SY2025–26 math coach data Work with OMI/ALSDE to receive SY2025–26 math coach info for all schools (assignments, number of schools' assigned math coaches, school's math coach funding source, math coach level of training/tier assigned, math coaches' other relevant professional learning and characteristics, coach implementation metrics⁹)	Analyze MTSS Year 4 annual survey data; prepare description of findings (narrative and tables) Work with OMI/ALSDE to receive school-level SY2025–26 data on tiered interventions from PowerSchool Coordinate with OMI and regional coordinators to determine availability of SY2025–26 Depth of Implementation (DOI) school-level scores	Analyze teacher math knowledge/pedagogy Year 4 annual survey data; prepare description of findings (narrative and tables) Administer SY2026–27 Mathematics for Teaching Tool (MTT)

⁸ Informed by OMI in May 2026 that SY2025–26 coach proficiency data would not be collected during the review meetings due to development of/transitioning to a new coach proficiency rubric. The coach evaluation study will be limited to available coach implementation metrics due to lack of SY2025–26 coach proficiency data.

⁹ The extent to which coach characteristics and implementation metrics are used for examining the relationship between various coaching factors and student achievement in all schools versus FS and LS schools will depend on the availability of such data.

Year 4 Timing	Math Coach Evaluation and Student Math Achievement	MTSS and Student Math Achievement	Teacher Math Knowledge/Pedagogy and Student Math Achievement
Oct – Dec 2026	Finalize SY2025–26 math coach study analysis plan based on available coach implementation metrics and coach characteristics as proxy for coach performance data Clean and prepare SY2025–26 math coach data and conduct analyses Prepare description of math coach study findings for Year 4 annual report (narrative and tables)	Merge school-level tiered intervention data from PowerSchool with SY2025–26 student achievement data and analyze; prepare findings (narrative and tables) Merge available school-level DOI data with SY2025–26 student achievement data and analyze; prepare findings (narrative and tables) Triangulate and prepare description of MTSS findings across annual survey, tiered intervention, interviews, FGs, DOI data, and student achievement data for Year 4 annual report (narrative and tables)	Merge and analyze SY2026–27 MTT data with previous years and SY2025–26 student achievement data; prepare description of findings (narrative and tables) Triangulate teacher math knowledge/pedagogy findings across Year 4 annual survey and MTT; prepare description of findings for Year 4 annual report (narrative and tables)

Year 4 Timing	Effectiveness of Screening Assessments	Unintended Consequences of the ANA	Stakeholder Awareness and Satisfaction
Jan – Mar 2026	Prepare screening assessment section of Year 3 annual report Draft and finalize screening/diagnostic assessment questions for Year 4 annual survey Draft and finalize screening/diagnostic assessment questions for spring 2026 FGs with regional coordinators, district staff, FS/LS principals, math coaches, and FS/LS K–5 teachers Discuss screening/diagnostic assessment questions during spring 2026 virtual FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches	Prepare unintended consequences of the ANA section of Year 3 annual report Draft and finalize unintended consequences questions for Year 4 annual survey Draft and finalize unintended consequences questions for spring 2026 FGs with parents, regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, math coaches, FS/LS principals, and FS/LS K–5 teachers Discuss unintended consequences questions during spring 2026 in-person FGs with parents Discuss unintended consequences questions during spring 2026 virtual FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches	Prepare stakeholder awareness and satisfaction section of Year 3 annual report Draft and finalize stakeholder awareness and satisfaction questions for Year 4 annual survey Draft and finalize stakeholder awareness and satisfaction questions for spring 2026 FGs with parents, regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, math coaches, FS/LS principals, and FS/LS K–5 teachers Discuss stakeholder awareness and satisfaction questions during spring 2026 in-person FGs with parents Discuss stakeholder awareness and satisfaction questions during spring 2026 virtual FGs with regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches
Apr – June 2026	Clean and analyze screening/diagnostic assessment Year 4 annual survey data Discuss screening/diagnostic assessment questions during spring 2026 virtual FGs with FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers Analyze spring 2026 virtual FG data separately by regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches; prepare findings (narrative and tables)	Clean and analyze unintended consequences Year 4 annual survey data Discuss unintended consequences questions during spring 2026 virtual FGs with FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers Analyze spring 2026 parent in-person FG data; prepare findings (narrative and tables)	Clean and analyze stakeholder awareness and satisfaction Year 4 annual survey data Discuss stakeholder awareness and satisfaction questions during spring 2026 virtual FGs with FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers Analyze spring 2026 parent in-person FG data; prepare findings (narrative and tables)

Year 4 Timing	Effectiveness of Screening Assessments	Unintended Consequences of the ANA	Stakeholder Awareness and Satisfaction
		Analyze spring 2026 virtual FG data separately by regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches; prepare findings (narrative and tables)	Analyze spring 2026 virtual FG data separately by regional coordinators, district/LEA staff, and math coaches; prepare findings (narrative and tables)
July – Sept 2026	Analyze spring 2026 virtual FG data separately by FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers; prepare findings (narrative and tables) Work with OMI/ALSDE to receive SY2025–26 student (a) screening/diagnostic assessment data and (b) tiered services/ math-related diagnosis classifications	Analyze spring 2026 virtual FG data separately by FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers; prepare findings (narrative and tables)	Analyze spring 2026 virtual FG data separately by FS/LS principals and FS/LS K–5 teachers; prepare findings (narrative and tables)
Oct – Dec 2026	Clean and analyze SY2025–26 student screening/ diagnostic assessment and tiered services/ diagnosis data Triangulate Year 4 annual survey, spring 2026 virtual FG screening/ diagnostic assessment, and SY2025–26 screening/diagnostic assessment and tiered services/diagnosis data, as appropriate Prepare screening/diagnostic assessment section of Year 4 annual report (narrative and tables)	Triangulate Year 4 annual survey and spring 2026 FG unintended consequences data, as appropriate Prepare unintended consequences section of Year 4 annual report	Triangulate Year 4 annual survey and spring 2026 FG stakeholder awareness and satisfaction data, as appropriate Prepare stakeholder awareness and satisfaction section of Year 4 annual report

Year 4 Timing	Comparison	Cost Effectiveness Analysis
Jan – Mar 2026	Prepare comparison study section of Year 3 annual report	Prepare ANA cost effectiveness section of the Year 3 annual report Draft and finalize ANA cost questions for Year 4 annual survey Work with OMI/ALSDE to collect and verify SY2024–25 and SY2025–26 public/non-public ANA cost data
Apr – June 2026	Work with OMI/ALSDE to receive SY2025–26 school math coach and individual math coach performance data ¹⁰	Clean and analyze cost ANA cost Year 4 annual survey data Continue to work with OMI/ALSDE to collect and verify SY2024–25 and SY2025–26 public/non-public ANA cost data
July – Sept 2026	Receive and clean SY2025–26 math coach school assignment data Conduct preliminary analysis of SY2025–26 school math coach and individual math coach data; if sufficient comparison schools, develop plans for retrospective quasi-experimental design (QED) study	Obtain ANA cost data from public sources; verify accuracy with OMI/ALSDE Merge and analyze ANA SY2025–26 cost data and cost data from Year 4 annual survey
Oct – Dec 2026	Finalize SY2025–26 comparison study impact analysis plan Conduct SY2025–26 impact analysis Prepare comparison study section of Year 4 annual report (narrative and tables)	Triangulate Year 4 annual survey and public/non-public ANA cost findings Prepare description of ANA cost findings for Year 4 annual report (narrative and tables/figures)

¹⁰ Informed by OMI in May 2026 that SY2025–26 coach proficiency data would not be collected during the review meetings due to development of/transitioning to a new coach proficiency rubric. The comparison study will be limited to available coach implementation metrics due to lack of SY2025–26 coach proficiency data.