DRAFT

MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH TEXTBOOK REVIEW
MEETING MINUTES
FOR 1/2/07

Committee members in attendance: Eli Normoyle, Ericka Boysen, Michael Cimino, Debbi Hardy, Matt McCauley, Monica West, Julie McDougall, Kate Trafton, Dan Casler, Jan Stuckey, Michelle Parvinen, Carla Borgaard, Jennifer Anders, Lynne Cranston, Theresa Tsou, Chris Mondau, Kelly Pankau, George Strid, Joni Wolpert, Maureen Rathbone and Vickie Tuvey. Tricia Kelley present as recorder of minutes. Dick Withycombe present as facilitator.

Agenda handed out, and Dick asked committee members to note times listed for each agenda item. In an effort to hold to our time limit and get through as many agenda items as possible, he has assigned blocks of time to each agenda item and will try to hold the committee to these. Minutes were reviewed from the 12/6/06 meeting. It was noted that the strike-through on page 2 denotes a need to verify this information with Eric McDowell from Bellevue S.D. Once this information is confirmed with him, it will either be included or deleted. No other exceptions or comments concerning the minutes. They were approved as is.

Dick asked for discussion concerning our four questions from the last meeting.

Question: Where do we have agreement?
Discussion included:

- We need to do something to address the issue of lower performing students in the Olympia School District.
- We want our successful population to continue being successful, and our decision needs to include their needs.
- The curriculum should include both computational and problem solving strands.
- We must prepare kids to be ready for high school math. Kids need to be successful in math at high school, and we must create a foundation for their success.
- We must insure that students are gaining the knowledge and skills to be successful on the WASL. (This is different than high school math readiness).
- Our choice should be based on data driven information. There was disagreement on this statement, as we haven't yet reached agreement on what data is valid….WASL data? OSPI data? ….
- One member mentioned that a 6th grade class at RMS has surpassed WASL scores using Glencoe. This class included a wide range of student abilities from average to high level. The curriculum was supplemented. This can be discussed further in the later agenda item of Pilot Review.

Question: Where do we have disagreement?
Discussion included:

- What constitutes the evaluative basis for reliable data for making this decision.

- What data is of value to us.
- The extent and nature of the change in curriculum; wholesale change vs. modest change.
- How students best learn and retain knowledge.
- Standards for evaluating curriculum are not clear or discerned. What standards should our students meet and how do we use that as a criteria for selecting curriculum? ie., EALRs, California State Standards, etc.
- What does "preparing our students for high school" mean. It was suggested that with the wide range of students, and if we realize in Washington state that the barrier is passing the WASL at 10th grade, than all students should enter high school at a minimum of Algebra I. There was discussion as to whether this is doable. The question was posed that whether doable or not would this be an appropriate standard for choosing a math curriculum.

A committee member expressed concern over our time limitations and whether we are straying off topic. Dick suggested that because of time and our need to set up criteria for our next meeting, we should forgo the last 2 questions and continue to discuss criteria.

It was suggested that Bellevue S.D. has high standards, and could we look to those for a basis of our criteria. Concern was expressed that this group is charged with choosing curriculum, and not rewriting standards for the OSD. By law the standards are already set for what we must teach. One member commented that these standards should include math fluency and computational skills, the ability to problem solve and be analytical, making sure students are successful in courses, and keeping the door open for students to learn. Another member shared that there is a new publication coming out of state standards. They have not changed significantly, but there is more clarity of language in the new publication. The Math Task Force worked last year on OSD minimum standards and determined that these should include Algebra I by 9th grade and Geometry by 10th grade. This is the goal for the OSD.

Dick posed the question: Given this discussion, can we agree that our framework for OSD standards is:

Algebra I by 9th grade
Geometry by 10th grade
Math fluency and computational skills
Ability to problem solve and be analytical
Student success, and keeping the door open for student learning opportunities post high school.

There were no comments or disagreement from the committee.

There was committee discussion regarding how kids learn. One member commented that it is not a philosophical issue, but proven in research, and we must be open to looking at this research. A committee member commented that research changes and can be found to support beliefs. Another member questioned whether we really know if we disagree on how kids learn, as we have not all expressed our views on this topic. Due to time limitations, Dick asked us to move on to the next agenda item.

The Community Forum and Middle School Teachers Meeting will be help on the same day, Feb. 1st. The Middle School Teachers Meeting will be open only to middle school math teachers who will notified by invitation to attend from 3:30-5:00pm on Feb. 1st. The Community Forum is open to the community and will be from 6:30-8:00pm. The committee members will all encouraged to attend. The committee will present research data, visitations, books reviewed and perspectives on curriculum adoption. There will be time for questions and comments from those in attendance. Let Matt McCauley know after today's meeting if you can help with presenting a portion of information at this event.

Theresa Tsou would like to have time to share some statewide data she has compiled from the WASL scores. She will need about 15 minutes for this presentation. This presentation will look at statewide data, not just OSD data, and will be linked to curriculums being used in other districts. It was agreed she could have time to present this information at a later meeting.

Dick asked the teachers who are piloting math programs to speak regarding these programs. Ericka Boysen, Eli Normoyle, Vickie Tuvey, Kate Trafton and Kelly Pankau all spoke concerning their pilots. Their comments included:

- One teacher is using 6th grade CMP2 with a more advanced 6th grade class. Many of her students have previously had Math Trailblazers. Her class goal is to get through all 8 books this year. She received a lot of information and support from other teachers in the summer training she attended. She has previously taught from Glencoe. Her students in the CMP2 class are very engaged. The curriculum is geared to real life situations and kids are learning to apply what they learn to other situations.
- One teacher is using the 7th grade CMP2 curriculum. She has taught with 2 other curriculums prior to CMP2. She did not attend the summer training, but has received support from other teachers within the district. She is learning to navigate through CMP2, but has found it to be difficult. Because her students did not have CMP2 in 6th grade, she is having to fill gaps. They did not get the foundation in 6th grade, so their learning is sometimes sketchy. CMP2 does focus on concepts using themes, and builds on the learning. Her students seem to like it, but she feels they are missing some skills. The learning is repetitive, so for higher end kids, she has to know when to move on, so they stay engaged and do not get bored.
- One teacher is using 7th grade CMP2. His students have an advantage of having been taught some 6th grade CMP2, so they are moving well through the 7th grade books. The program builds on itself. He felt Glencoe was a bit of a "throw away" curriculum; you teach it, they learn it, then they forget it. With CMP2, he finds he can go back to an old concept and his students still remember how to do it. He is having fun with it. Parents are happy. Kids who were struggling with Glencoe are understanding concepts with CMP2. The approach is a shift for teachers. Lower level kids are contributing because the learning relates to real life situations. Implementing CMP2 at 6th, 7th and 8th all in one year could be done, but it would be difficult.
- One teacher is using 6th grade CMP2 with lower to mid-level students. The kids are learning and retaining concepts they have struggled with in the past. Teachers have to

learn how to teach kids in groups. They will need training so they can do this effectively. Her kids were engaged and doing quality work today after being on a 2 week break. It is taking longer to get through some lessons than the book recommends. She will be doing MAP testing on this class, and will bring the results in for the committee. She sees kids who have previously struggled being successful with CMP2.

- One teacher is using CMP2 as a pilot and likes the flexibility of implementation. She supplements with computation and has pulled some supplemental material from Glencoe. She attended the summer training for CMP2. She has a challenging group of students. Sometimes the students may not get the main point, but they always have interesting insights and she will guide them to the main point in her teaching. CMP2 has good vocabulary and applications. Professional development needs to include instructional techniques and how to teach when working with groups.
- A principal from one of the schools piloting CMP2 spoke regarding lower level learners. He commented that these kids at 6th grade can move at a slower pace through the books, and then at 7th grade they may take 2 math classes. The school can double dip using LAP federal funding.

Dick asked for a review of the Holt visitation from the members who went. The comments from members visiting this school are as follows. It was hard to compare to other curriculums, partly because the school had an unusual bell schedule; from 55 minutes for higher level learners on up to 90 minutes for lower level learners. The book seemed good and clear. Kids who are struggling get more instructional time. The district went to Holt because they felt kids were missing some skills. There were conflicting reports from different teachers on whether they liked it as a curriculum. There were lots of supplemental materials available and used in classes. The district had been using a reform math curriculum, and changed to Holt because the district couldn't continue to provide the staff development needed for the reform curriculum. It was too hard to continue with the reform curriculum without the staff development to support it. Lessons and information is available on the computer for parents and students to use from home. Instruction was inconsistent from teacher to teacher. The school principal and some of the teachers said Holt does not align with state standards. However, another teacher from the school said it did.

A committee member made a comment that CMP2 has been beneficial at their school because it has increased staff camaraderie, teachers and kids are enjoying it and parents are supportive.

Dick adjourned the meeting.

Next Meeting:

Monday, January 8th, 8:00am – 5:00pm, Knox Board Room.