

DRAFT
MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH TEXTBOOK REVIEW
MEETING MINUTES
FOR 2/7/07

Committee members in attendance: Chris Sogn, Keith Barber, Randy Lobe, 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, Jennifer Anders, 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. Dick Withycombe present as facilitator.

Minutes from the meeting on 1/22/07 were reviewed. Change on page 3, second paragraph, second sentence should read “Failing that, should we take a vote?” Change on page 4, second paragraph, fourth sentence should read “Another member commented that she is frustrated that we are looking at potentially dismantling a curriculum that is already successfully working with no guarantee that it will help the lower 30%. She has a level one WASL 6th grader and CMP2 would not help him because he (like many others) also struggles with reading and writing. This curriculum would make him more frustrated because it is all language based.” Change on page 4, second paragraph, ninth sentence should read “One committee member commented that adopting multiple texts would be difficult and financially unrealistic.” Minutes approved with changes.

Dick would like us to review the forums from 2/1/07 and to talk about our perceptions. What do we know? What have we heard? He would like the group to share their professional views, and to listen respectfully to one another.

One committee member commented that several parents appreciated how Dick facilitated the evening forum.

Dick asked for members to share “what they heard” at the forums:

- Parents don’t want to be taken out of the loop in helping their students.
- An important concern is staff development.
- Parents are concerned that constructive math would not fit into the time allowed in a regular school day schedule.
- There needs to be better communication from schools to parents, especially for ESL families.
- There were questions about how we would phase CMP2 in to the middle schools.
- The faculty who are doing student learning research support a constructive type approach.
- There a pros and cons for both programs.
- A concern was expressed by a parent that there should be clear objectives stated in each chapter of the textbook, and CMP2 isn’t clear.
- One member was touched by a parent who spoke about their student who is a special ed. student.

- We did hear people talk about the pros and cons of CMP2, and we did hear from parents wanting OSD to adopt McDougal Littell, but we didn't hear any reasons "why" we should support McDougal Littell. The focus was on CMP2, both positive and negative.
- Several members were disappointed that there were so few teachers at the afternoon forum.
- We haven't heard much about elementary math.
- We heard a lot of passion and concern from the public.

Other comments and opinions from the committee:

- One member was insulted by the TESC faculty comment about the new look of CMP2 causing fear.
- 60% of JMS students are in one of their CMP2 classes. They have not received any negative calls or comments concerning CMP2 regarding homework, etc. from parents.
- One committee member has heard many negative comments about Math Trailblazers (MTB).
- Another member commented that while MTB and CMP2 are similar, there are also many differences, and there are also many differences in the basic structure of how math is taught in elementary and middle school.
- A large percentage of the districts are doing well with CMP2.
- The district has probably not support MTB enough, and there are some holes. CMP2 is a newer generation and many of the holes are filled.
- One member was disappointed that parents with students doing well in CMP2 did not come to speak.
- When two JMS parents were asked how CMP2 is going for their students, both responded that they love it. The same parents when asked to speak at the meeting said they were afraid to speak up because there has been too much negative press from OlyPARM.
- One member questioned what the socio-economic makeup is of the people speaking out against CMP2. They also commented that lower income, lower functioning families may not speak out for themselves and their children.
- There were some initial concerns early in the year about the CMP2 pilot class at WMS, but since then there has been few, if any complaints from the families with children in the CMP2 pilots.
- There have been positive comments from parents about how helpful the on-line assistance is for CMP2.
- One CMP2 pilot class was interviewed by The Olympian. Comments from the kids included them noting the some people are afraid of change, and some people are afraid that we can't learn using CMP2.
- There are many parents who can't help their children with math after the 6th grade, no matter what the curriculum is.
- One teachers sees more and more supplementation in MTB. Will this also happen with CMP2?
- Training is vital – with MTB also. Other districts are more successful with MTB because of ongoing training. That may be a shortfall of OSD.

- CMP2 is an opportunity to give kids a new way to be successful. It could be very exciting if we can get past the fear.
- If you just flip through CMP2 books, then basic skills is lacking, but it is in the supplementals provided by CMP2. It is “my job” (the teacher) to use them. Basic skills are easy to supplement. It is much more time consuming and difficult to find applications and fill holes in traditional math curriculum. Parents with kids in my class had some initial concerns with CMP2, but through communication and the on-line help there is no longer any problems or concerns.

Dick asked the committee to discuss what data is pertinent to our decision and is technically accurate. One member made up a document of what we know about each curriculum. He passed it out and asked everyone to look over. The information presented is either data or factual information or things we know based on our discussions. Comments about the document were:

- How are we going to get teachers to attend the staff development for CMP2? It is not a contractual issue.
- Some larger states have used reform math curriculum and may change back to traditional.
- One member said that nothing presented to date has convinced him to switch to CMP2.
- OSD will need to have conversations with certificated staff regarding how to get the staff development for CMP2 implemented, so staff can get trained.
- The cost difference between the 2 curriculums is not substantially different.
- There will be staff development needed for either curriculum. We will also need to have parent nights to support math, no matter which we choose. The Teaching and Learning department is working on curriculum guides for parents.
- No hard figures are available regarding the cost of parent support, but the district has said they will support this either way.
- The Board’s focus is to support kids and parents.
- Have we factored replacement costs in for books for CMP2 since they are paperback? Replacement of books has not been a major problem in other districts using CMP2. The books fit into binders and students don’t keep the books the whole year. Cost of replacing a CMP2 book is \$8. They are also available in hardbound, but most districts have not felt the need to purchase them in hardbound format.
- Staff development for CMP2 would require an initial week long training, which we could probably partner with Yelm or North Thurston S.D. There would then be follow up training once every 5-6 weeks. Staff development for McDougal Littell would require an initial 2-3 day training. There would also need to be additional training in the areas of application and problem solving, since McDougal Littell is weaker in those areas. Funding for staff development is available with our adoption funds and also from our Title II grant which is specifically to be used for the purposed of staff development. PLC groups can also be formed for collaboration time. We could also buy some addition sub days or optional days for extra release and planning time.

- Certificated contract staff development and LID days are also available to be used for the purpose of math training.
- We will need to research as to what would be best as a phase in plan. We may hold back some funds to be used as needed depending on the phase in plan.
- We have greater power in determining staff development opportunities if we can partner with neighboring districts using the same curriculum.
- One member expressed that through DMI and other trainings, she has realized that there aren't that many holes in MTB. She's learning how to use the program more effectively. The holes are with her level of expertise, that's why ongoing training is so important.
- It comes down to what works for kids and their learning, not what is easy and safe.
- What was the agreement about the materials used for the CMP2 pilots? These materials were provided at no cost to OSD, with the agreement that if we go with CMP2 we will add them in to the cost of adoption, and if we don't go with CMP2 they will take the materials back at no cost to OSD.
- We had limited data collection. Without the MAP testing data from the pilots, we could not use it as a filter for our decision.
- One member does not see this document as being accurate data.
- This document lists things we know, not just hard data. It was presented as cause for discussion.
- Debating is fruitless. How can we proceed to a decision? Our decision may not be data driven, but there are many strong opinions.
- Teachers need to provide students with a context for learning. This is built up over the years, and when the teacher leaves their context leaves. We need a curriculum that supports the context for learning.
- One member spent 3 years teaching CMP in another district. CMP2 is superior to CMP. The district he taught in had a highly transient population, with many low ability kids. With Glencoe, only 9% of the students passed the math portion of the WASL. After 2 years with CMP they went up to a 26% passing rate. This was a substantial gain.

Are there other options that this committee could consider as a recommendation to the Board? Comments included:

- Could we buy 6th and 7th grade CMP2 and then offer the traditional book in 8th grade. In that way experience the transition from constructivist to traditional approach in the 8th grade instead of as students enter high school.
- If CMP2 is chosen as the core text, could we form a subcommittee to look at ways to set up different tracks, i.e. a traditional track, a slower CMP2 track and a faster CMP2 track?
- The concept is good, but we couldn't promise that staff and parents would get to choose which track a student is placed in. It would also have to be based on class sizes and students academic needs. It would not be perfect for all, and could vary from school to school.
- Several members expressed concerns with placing all students in 8th grade algebra, and also with having the option of pre-algebra at 6th grade.

- Could we adopt McDougal Littell as the core and supplement with CMP2 by training teachers how to teach the constructivist way?
- Are we considering the idea of kids having the option to choose?
- How we advance kids is based on our core curriculum. It would be problematic for placement alone to combine 2 curriculums.
- Several members commented they are against the idea of choosing 2 curriculums. Putting together class schedules and parents wanting the option to choose would be a problem, and the class sizes could all be skewed. And if we go just by test scores on where to place students, then the affect could be a homogeneous mix.
- After we vote we can look at forming a sub group to look at other ways to implement. There is great value in further discussion, but we must make a decision.

Dick asked for us to proceed to a vote. The number on the committee eligible to vote is 27. Dick shared that one member was not present due to extenuating circumstances. He had cast his vote separately and it will only be counted if the committee agrees to include it. It was decided not to allow the vote to be included.

26 votes were anonymously cast. 1 person abstained, 10 voted for McDougal Littell (38.5%), and 16 voted for CMP2 (61.5%). Since this does not meet our criteria for a decision (65% or greater), the information (including issues, concerns and vote outcome) will be presented to the Board on 2/12/07 for them to use in making a decision concerning a middle school math adoption.

Thank yous were expressed to the committee members and to Dick Withycombe for their commitment to this process.

Meeting adjourned.