The consistency of our findings over ten (of the 15) coordinated papers established two things: first, that the three NSF supported curricula (Core+, IMP and MMOW) prepared students equally well for college mathematics, and, secondly that the anti-reform mathematicians were “shooting from the hip” and had it all wrong. These understandings are important for our field in that they open the door to a wide variety of other successful programs that are more desirable in many ways than traditional textbook approaches to the subject.

In total, our findings suggest, there are good reasons to consider a more active and intense problem-solving focused approach to high school mathematics as envisioned by the author teams of the three integrated curricula, and, the NCTM Standards related publications.

Such an approach is designed to be accessible to a wider range of students and has both psychological and sociological advantages for students. It is also far more consistent with the cognitive perspective of mathematics learning as we now understand it.

We conclude that there is no royal road to success in college mathematics. Our findings suggest that multiple and very different approaches in both content and method are worthy of serious consideration.