## An evaluation of a JUMP Math pilot programme in Ireland

Eemer Eivers, Emer Delaney and Seán Close

**Educational Research Centre** 

## **Contents**

|     | List of Acronyms and Abbreviations                  |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 1.  | Introduction  |     |
| ١.  |   |     |
|     | Genesis of the project                              |     |
|     | Research design                                     |     |
|     | Nature of support provided to schools               |     |
| _   | ····  |     |
| 2.  | Assessment methods                                  |     |
|     | JUMP materials and the Irish curriculum             |     |
|     | Classroom observations                              |     |
|     | Questionnaires                                      |     |
|     | Interviews  |     |
|     | Teacher mathematical knowledge                      |     |
|     | Pupil achievement                                   |     |
|     | Response rates                                      |     |
| _   | •   |     |
| 3.  | Analysis of materials                               |     |
|     | Overview of JUMP materials                          |     |
|     | JUMP materials and the PSMC                         |     |
|     | JUMP materials and Irish textbooks                  |     |
|     | Summary   |     |
| 4.  | Classroom observations                              |     |
|     | Types of observation data                           | 31  |
|     | Curriculum areas covered                            | 33  |
|     | Adherence to programme methods and principles       | 34  |
|     | Quality of instruction                              |     |
|     | General comments on lessons                         |     |
|     | Summary   | 48  |
| 5   | Pupils  | 49  |
|     | Attitudes to school                                 | 50  |
|     | Attitudes to mathematics                            | 50  |
|     | Experience of mathematics instruction               |     |
|     | Use of learning strategies                          |     |
|     | Summary   |     |
| 6.  | Teachers  | 59  |
|     | Teacher characteristics                             | 59  |
|     | Typical mathematics lessons                         | 63  |
|     | Teacher views on programme/evaluation               | 68  |
|     | Summary   | 75  |
| 7.  | Mathematics achievement                             | 77  |
|     | Overall score on the DPMT                           | 77  |
|     | Performance on strands and content areas            |     |
|     | Achievement by gender                               | 80  |
|     | Results of initially low- and high-achieving pupils |     |
|     | Observation type and pupil achievement              | 82  |
|     | Teacher variables and pupil achievement             |     |
|     | Pupil attitudes and pupil achievement               |     |
|     | Summary   | 89  |
| 8.  | Conclusions   | 91  |
|     | The research questions                              | 92  |
|     | What contributed to improved achievement?           |     |
|     | Future possibilities                                |     |
| Dof | orance  | 103 |

## **List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**

| BLM     | Blackline Masters  |
|---------|--|
| CBU     | Confidence Building Unit   |
| CPD     | Continuing Professional Development  |
| DPMT    | Drumcondra Primary Mathematics Test  |
| ERC     | Educational Research Centre  |
| IMPACT  | Interactive Methods and Practical Approaches to Communication and Thinking |
| JUMP    | Junior Undiscovered Math Prodigies   |
| MKT     | Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching  |
| MKTQ    | Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching Questionnaire                          |
| MKTQ-S  | Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching Questionnaire – Shortened              |
| MQI     | Mathematical Quality of Instruction  |
| NCCA    | National Council for Curriculum and Assessment                             |
| OCUP    | Ontario Curriculum Unit Planner  |
| PDST    | Professional Development Service for Teachers                              |
| PSMC    | Primary School Mathematics Curriculum                                      |
| SD      | Standard Deviation   |
| SIGMA-T | Standardised Irish Graded Mathematics Attainment Test                      |
| SME     | Subject Matter Expert  |
| TIMSS   | Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study                      |
| WNCP    | Western and Northern Canadian Protocol                                     |

## **Acknowledgements**

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Department of Education and Skills (DES), Science Foundation Ireland, and Accenture, and the helpful input of the JUMP Math Steering Committee. The Steering Committee members were Ciarán Cannon (TD, Minister of State for Training and Skills 2011-14), Eamon Clavin (DES), Seán Delaney (Marino Institute of Education), Anne Feerick (DES), Pamela Fitzgerald (Change Nation), Aoife Kelly (National Council for Curriculum and Assessment), Bernard Kirk (Galway Education Centre), and Frank Walsh (Athlone Education Centre). The Educational Research Centre (ERC) was represented by Eemer Eivers, Emer Delaney, and Seán Close.

For the professional development provided to participants, we thank Dr John Mighton from JUMP Math, and Ciara O'Donnell, Mia Treacy, and Michael James Malone from the Professional Development Service for Teachers. Bernard Kirk, Frank Walsh, and staff at Galway and Athlone Education Centres organised Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for participating teachers, and acted as helpful points of contact for the various stakeholders.

Thanks are due to those who conducted our observations, including Dr Dolores Corcoran, Margaret Cooney, John Curran, Pat Moore, and Susan Murray. A number of staff at the ERC provided much appreciated support, including Peter Archer (Acting Director), John Coyle, Paula Chute, Aidan Clerkin, Lauren Kavanagh, Mary Lewis, David Millar, Adrian O'Flaherty, Mary Rohan and Hilary Walshe.

Finally, warmest thanks are due to all participating teachers, pupils, and principals, without whom the evaluation could not have been carried out.