Errata

The following errors appeared in one paragraph of “What Students Notice as Different Between Reform and Traditional Mathematics Programs,” by Jon R. Star, John P. Smith III, and Amanda Jansen (January 2008, pp. 9–32).

1. On p. 12, the sentence begins, “One (U1) used materials developed by the Harvard Calculus Consortium. . . .” This clause actually refers to U2.
2. Later in the same sentence on p. 13, the text reads, “the other (U2) a more traditional set of texts and teaching methods for these courses. . . .” This clause actually refers to U1.
3. In a subsequent sentence, on p. 13, the text reads, “At U1 we recruited graduates of traditional programs. . . .” This clause refers to U2.
4. Later in this same sentence, on p. 13, the text reads, “at U2 we recruited from a smaller pool of CPMP graduates. . . .” This clause refers to U1.

The corrected paragraph is reprinted below, with the corrections indicated in bold.

Design: Sites, Curricula, and Participants

Given our intent to locate and analyze what students found different between traditional and Standards-based curricula, we needed sites where relatively abrupt shifts between such programs took place. We sought these curricular shifts at two major junctures in students’ mathematical histories: the steps from junior high to high school and from high school to college. At these two junctures, we sought schools and colleges with solid records of using reform materials. At the 6–12 level, our search was aided by numerous (though still very spotty) implementations of two Standards-based curricula written in our region—the Connected Mathematics Project materials (CMP) (Lappan, Fey, Friel, Fitzgerald, & Phillips, 1995) for grades 6–8 and the Core-Plus Mathematics Project materials (CPMP) (Hirsch, Coxford, Fey, & Schoen, 1996) for grades 9–12. We located a nearby district where CMP graduates moved into a traditional high school program (HS1) and another where high school students used the CPMP materials after a traditional junior high program (HS2). Two local universities provided complementary college sites. One (U2) used materials developed by the Harvard Calculus Consortium (HCC) (Connally, Hughes-Hallett, & Gleason, 1998; Hughes-Hallett & Gleason, 1994) for all sections of Pre-Calculus, Calculus I, and Calculus II; the other (U1) a more traditional set of texts and teaching methods for these courses (e.g., Thomas & Finney, 1996). Pre-Calculus, Calculus I, and Calculus II were semester courses at both universities. At U2 we recruited graduates of traditional programs; at U1 we recruited from a smaller pool of CPMP graduates and also added graduates of a nearby high school that had developed its own mathematics program based on the NCTM Standards. Because we wanted to understand students’ mathematical
experiences in some depth and over a relatively long period of time, we limited our research design to a single site per cell so that we could carefully examine a sizable sample of students at each site. These choices produced the site design matrix presented in Table 1.
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