

DRAFT
MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH TEXTBOOK REVIEW
MEETING MINUTES
FOR 1/8/07

Committee members in attendance: Chris Sogn, Keith Barber, Chris McNabb, Eli Normoyle, Ericka Boysen, Michael Cimino, Debbi Hardy, Matt McCauley, Monica West, Julie McDougall, Kate Trafton, Linda Nelson, Dan Casler, Jan Stuckey, Michelle Parvinen, Carla Borgaard, Lynne Cranston, Marta Gomez-Buckley, Steven Kant, Theresa Tsou, Chris Mondau, Kelly Pankau, Duncan Clarke, George Strid, Joni Wolpert, Maureen Rathbone, and Vickie Tuvey. Tricia Kelley present as recorder of minutes. As previously agreed by committee, Matt McCauley and Debbi Hardy acting as facilitators.

Opened meeting with welcome and thank you to everyone for their time and commitment to this process. The schedule for today's review is busy, and it will be important to keep to the time allowed each item. Debbi Hardy will take the committee through the process of curriculum alignment. We will filter through the traditional curriculum choices in the morning to narrow it down to one choice. CMP2 was tabled last year by the School Board. There was concern and discussion by several members concerning today's process and that the committee was narrowing down the traditional curriculum first, and not including CMP2 in the morning's schedule. Other members expressed that because CMP2 was tabled by the Board, and the work done last year, it would be a step backwards to not narrow down the traditional curriculums. We will follow the process for today based on the prep work already done. All 4 curriculums are being reviewed today. In the afternoon, CMP2 will be reviewed and aligned along with the traditional curriculum chosen from the morning work. We want all members to contribute to today's discussions, and would ask members to limit their responses to 1-2 minutes, so there is an opportunity for all members to speak. At the end of the day we will look at other filters for our decision process. The small groups have been configured intentionally, to include at each table a parent, an administrator, and teachers (at least one per table from the middle school level). The morning will be spent reviewing the 3 traditional curriculums (1 hour per curriculum). In the afternoon we will do a deep alignment of the Algebra strands and EALRs 2-5 on CMP2 and the traditional curriculum chosen (1 hour per curriculum).

On the back side of the agenda is listed the criteria from last year's process and the OSD Board Policy 2020 regarding criteria. There are Evaluation Record forms for each curriculum. On these forms, the 5 criteria are listed with an area for scoring and comments. Scoring is from 0 – 3; red flag comments are for problems or concerns, and green flag comments are for something positive or exceptional about the curriculum. An Evaluation Rubrics form is also included in the green folder. This is a scoring guide for each of the 5 criteria on the Evaluation Record form. Debbi reviewed these rubrics, with some questions and discussion from the committee. Grade Level GLEs and Summary is also included in the packet (one for each middle school grade level). We for certain want to look at the Algebra strands. What other 2 strands should we look at? Measurement and number sense were recommended by 3 teachers on the committee. Debbi asked that

the last 10 minutes of each curriculum review/alignment be used for discussion at your table, and to compile a combined score. Put this score on the blue sheet. We will use these scores for ranking the curriculums.

Committee worked at tables in small groups, after which lunch was served.

Following lunch, the groups shared their score rankings. These are listed in the table below:

GROUP	1	2	3	4	5	6
Glencoe	11	9	10	9	10	9
Holt	8	11	13 12.5	11	11	10
McDougal-Littell	14	13	12	13	14	11

Red and green light comments include:

McDougal-Littell: Application is adequate, but support is needed.

Holt: Measurement is weak. It is the weakest of all 3 for conceptual examples.

Overwhelmed by the 7th grade book; there was too much material covered in the text.

The question was asked of Group 3: Can you live with McDougal-Littell being the choice. Yes. The committee agreed to that McDougal-Littell is the recommended curriculum of these 3 traditional texts.

Kate Trafton shared a Powerpoint presentation on CMP2. The Powerpoint presentation will be available on the district website, or from the K-12 Teaching and Learning office. The presentation included a demonstration on how to select practice questions using the Examview Test Generator software to generate tests. The software allows you to select test questions sorted by state standards. It lists questions sorted by state GLEs. You can also select by concept themes, to formulate practice questions around concept areas that may need additional practice. CMP2 also has skills worksheets available, and Kate has used these, as well as customized tests to focus on specific skill work in her class. Most likely similar software is available for McDougal-Littell, however, this presentation was made because of concern expressed from several committee members regarding skill practice work available in CMP2.

Debbi Hardy discussed with the committee the afternoon process of aligning CMP2 and McDougal-Littell. We will spend 1 hour each on CMP2 and McDougal-Littell. There was discussion from the committee regarding whether we should do a deep alignment with CMP2 on all strands, given that the OSPI report we have available to us was on CMP1. Today, because of time limitations, we will do a deep alignment on CMP2 and McDougal-Littell only for the Algebra strands and EALRs 2-5. At the end of the day, if the committee feels it is necessary we can set up a separate meeting or sub-committee to

do a full alignment. Debbi presented and explained the Sub-set of GLEs for Algebraic Sense. It includes a goal statement and context (which pertains to rigor for different learners). We will use these to look more deeply at the CMP2 and McDougal-Littell. Using the GLEs and Rubrics, each table will score the curriculums on the Algebra & Embedded Process Criteria & Evaluation Rubrics form. Committees worked in small groups for 2+ hours on this process.

Based on this work, the following is the Ranking of GLE Alignment for Algebraic Sense strands:

GROUP	1	2	3	4	5	6
McDougal-Littell	20	18	24	24	29.5	29
CMP2	16	13	27	28	Did not finish	30

Matt asked for the pulse of the committee: Are we good with where we are with the 2 curriculums? Majority agreed, and there were no negative comments.

Matt asked for the committee to compile a list of other filters to be used for the decision making. Below is listed the Other Filters:

- ◆ Aligns with state standards
- ◆ Has balance – problem solving, critical thinking, applications, basic skills.....
- ◆ Ease of implementation
- ◆ Full cost
- ◆ Student interest/response
- ◆ Supplemental support
- ◆ Professional development
- ◆ Ability levels – meets needs of various levels of learners
- ◆ High school prep – transition
- ◆ Fit on continuum – elementary to middle school to high school
- ◆ Credit possibilities
- ◆ Supplementation ease – process vs. skills
- ◆ Retention of knowledge for students
- ◆ Impact on absent students
- ◆ Ease for parents
- ◆ Transition of elementary to middle school
- ◆ Data driven
- ◆ Research on how students learn
- ◆ OSD middle school teachers
- ◆ Addresses the issue of lower performing students
- ◆ Our successful population will continue being successful

Matt asked each member to review this list and come up with their top 5 filters before the next meeting. We will discuss and narrow it down at the next meeting. He also reminded everyone to read the book "Helping Children Learn Math" before the Jan. 16th meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

Upcoming Meetings:

Tuesday, January 16th, 3:30-5:30pm, Knox Board Room.

Thursday, February 1st, 3:30-5:00pm, Middle School Math Teachers Meeting, and 6:30-8:00pm, Community Forum.

Wednesday, February 7th, time to be discussed and determined