

DRAFT
MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH TEXTBOOK REVIEW
MEETING MINUTES
FOR 12/6/06

Committee members in attendance: Chris Sogn, Randy Lobe, Eli Normoyle, Ericka Boysen, Michael Cimino, Debbi Hardy, Matt McCauley, Monica West, Julie McDougell, Kate Trafton, Linda Nelson, 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. Several community members present as observers.

Dick asked committee to review minutes for 11/7/06 meeting and comment regarding any concerns or changes. Meeting minute changes/omissions suggested: Page 1/paragraph 5 should read: "meeting minutes" instead of agenda. Page 2/paragraph 2/last sentence should read: "5 parents are represented on the committee, 3 from WMS, 1 from MMS, and 1 from JMS." Page 2/paragraph 4/sentence 5 changed to read: "It was brought up that there are 5 administrators on the committee – 3 district staff and 2 principals. The question was on the voting rights of the district staff. Dick decided that we will fill the gaps in the committee, but will not take members off, with no discussion from the committee." Page 4 – bullet reading: "There are implications as you move from elementary to middle school to high school" will be removed from the minutes. The following statement will be added in its place: "One member offered the opinion that math performance in elementary schools seems to be a key factor that decides students performance in middle school. Based on 2006 WASL results, declines in student performance in math began in elementary schools. The downward trend was stopped or reversed at middle levels. Elementary school materials need to be better aligned with middle school materials. (This opinion was not based on data presented by Alice Burman at this meeting)." Minutes adopted with suggested changes.

A concern was expressed during the minutes review that the member would like to see an agenda in advance. Dick suggested that at the end of each meeting, he will ask for topics for the next meeting, and will include these topics in the formation of the agenda.

Dick asked new members, Duncan Clarke, Julie McDougall and Lynne Cranston, to introduce themselves and describe their current assignments with the Olympia School District. Dick asked for a quick round for all members to re-introduce themselves. Dan Casler was unable to attend this meeting, but sent notes from his visitation with Jan Stuckey.

We revisited the committee's agreement of who is on the committee as voting members.

Members shared the conversation from the Board Workstudy Session on November 20th. The question was asked as to why this was not advertised. It was advertised and has been on the Board agenda for some time, however apologies were expressed that this was not

specifically noted at our last meeting. This Board Workstudy Session offered the opportunity to look outside our school district; at the success of other districts, and at our lack of success in meeting all students' needs within our district. At high school level, approximately 200 OSD students have not passed the WASL in math, and approximately 1550 OSD primary through secondary students have been identified as being at risk.

Sherry Walton and Anita Lenges, The Evergreen State College educators, presented at the Board Workstudy Session. Their general message was that information needs to be made relevant to students' learning.

Eric McDowell, from Bellevue S.D. also presented. He discussed the success Bellevue S.D. is having in implementing CMP and their conversion last year to CMP2. 86% of their students are passing the WASL in math, and while their student demographics has not changed, there is growth in the number of students entering higher level math classes. They looked at both Traditional (with supplementals) and CMP (with supplementals) and went with CMP. They felt it was easier to supplement CMP and easier to transition into. Debbi Hardy can provide the Bellevue S.D. Powerpoint presentation to all interested. Upon presenter's approval, we will send it out as an attachment with the minutes. Anyone without Powerpoint software can contact Debbi Hardy or Tricia Kelley to get a hard copy. ~~Within Bellevue S.D., 91% of their seniors will graduate with at least 1 year of AP math credits, and some will graduate with as many as 4 years of AP math credits.~~ No data was available on how kids did on TIMSS test, nor information on the use of private tutors. Bellevue has grant money from Microsoft, and another source, that is being used for staff development. They also use extended planning time by re-arranging their school day, and use pull out options for kids who are struggling.

Visitations to other schools were discussed. The visitation scheduled for November 30 to University Place (Prentice-Hall Mathematics) was cancelled. Only 1 middle school teacher signed up to attend, and snow/weather conditions restricted driving conditions.

On December 4, a group visited Evergreen S.D./Shahala M.S. to look at CMP2. In attendance were 1 middle school teacher, 1 high school teacher, 1 Board member, and 2 district administrative office staff. The group observed several classes at different grades and at different performance grade-levels. One member observed that although they were all teaching from the same CMP2 curriculum, each teacher had their own style. Classes had longer instructional time, more time to teach. Classes began with 20 minutes of warm up, 5 minutes of writing/reviewing goals off the board, 20 minutes of problem solving with questioning. Students worked cooperatively in pairs. There was lots of equipment to support teaching (such as calculators, projectors). 2 observers felt students did well with what they were asked to do, but questioned whether they ever got to the answer. The students were very engaged. Several other observers saw that students did get to the answer, and they also observed students asking classmates how they got to the answer, not just what the answer was. Shahala M.S. has 4 – 80 minute blocks – they consisted of math, science, language arts, and other electives. This is their 4th year with CMP2, with 3 additional prior years of CMP1. Many teachers had questions posted on the wall. Students and teachers were good at asking questions, and learning how to and what questions to ask was part of the teaching. The group met with parents after the observations. The parents talked about their frustration early on with CMP1, with trying

to help their children with homework. They said the district has made changes over the years to support parents and students in this area, (i.e. with Math Nights).

Next week, December 12, there is a visitation planned to Snoqualmie M.S. (Holt mathematics). 2 middle school teachers are scheduled to attend. Can anyone else go? Steven Kant and Michelle Parvinen agreed to attend also.

New curriculum has become available since last years review. They are new editions of Holt, Prentice-Hall, and Saxon. Does the committee want to take additional time to review them? Last year we reviewed curriculum and identified Glencoe, McDougall-Littell and CMP2 as the final choices. This review was done as a group, with 45 minutes to review each curriculum available. To proceed, there seem to be 3 questions that need to be answered by the committee.

- ◆ Should we review the new edition of Saxon, when the previous edition was ruled out early on in last spring's review?
- ◆ Should we review the other 2 new curriculums?
- ◆ Should we re-review the 3 original choices?

There was a comment that more time is needed to review the curriculum; 45 minutes was not sufficient.

The question was posed of how different is the new Saxon from the old edition. One committee member, who has used Saxon extensively, said that while the new Saxon is expanded, he still prefers the old edition. After more discussion, Dick asked for a show of hands of how many committee members want to add Saxon to the review, and 4 members raised their hands. There was further discussion about Saxon include one comment that all options should be reviewed and another comment that we can never review everything. What is the criteria for reviewing the curriculum and for matching it to the EALRs? Saxon was pulled out of the OSPI GLE alignment review. There was not agreement from the committee on Saxon. However, it was determined that we will not include Saxon in a further review by the committee. Copies are available at the Teaching & Learning office for any sub-group who wants to review it. We can allow time for comments from those who review Saxon to share with the larger committee.

Should Holt and Prentice-Hall be added? Several people have reviewed these and were impressed by them. There was a concern expressed that there is not data available as to how they would align or how other districts have done with these because of them being new curriculum. It was suggested that if we are going to review curriculum again, we need to do 1 lesson from each curriculum. We won't know how a curriculum will work with kids unless we try the lesson ourselves. One member mentioned that the alignment tables were helpful last year when reviewing curriculum, and should be provided again. In the interest in moving forward, one member would like the committee to re-review only the 3 curriculums chosen last year. She feels that these 3 are a good representation. Dick asked for a show of hands on how many members want to review the 3 original choices again, plus Prentice-Hall and Holt. The vote was equally split. One member shared that a vendor from Prentice-Hall said the new edition was not much different from the previous, and there was not much interest statewide from other school districts in this new edition. It was suggested that we should contact Holt and ask what changes have been made in the new edition. If it is different enough,

we add it to the review, but then only do the 4 curriculums. One committee member expressed their frustration in reviewing everything again, because last spring the curriculum choices were already narrowed down based on lack of training support, GLE alignment and availability of materials. It was commented that a teacher's perspective is critical to our adoption.

Since no consensus was being reached, a committee member asked for a vote on the proposal that we re-review the original 3 curriculum and the new Holt book. Dick asked for a show of hands. There was a substantial majority in favor of this proposal, so a decision was noted as being reached.

Our next meeting is scheduled for 2 hours in mid-January, with a meeting in early February that would be when a Board recommendation should be reached. We need to add a meeting in early January to review the books, so that the mid-January meeting can be used for review discussion. It was suggested that in addition to the committee review, members can do a more in-depth review on their own. The 3 original choices are available in the schools, to look at, and Holt will also be ordered to get out to schools. Breakouts of costs, staff development and alignment can be worked on and provided at the review meeting, for part of the book review criteria. There was a question regarding how the OSPI alignment data was gathered and rated. It was shared that while publishers provided information, teachers rated it for alignment.

A meeting is scheduled to review the 4 curriculums for Monday, January 8th from 8am – 5pm in the Knox Board Room with lunch provided. Debbi Hardy will facilitate the review. We will use the same criteria from last year and the OSPI alignment information, as well as costs and staff development information. Each curriculum will have 1 hour and 15-20 minutes for review. There will be some discussion, but we will also use the January 16th meeting for continued discussion.

Frustration was expressed by some of the members doing the CMP2 pilot programs. They would like to share their experience and feel their information will have value in this process. We need to make time at a meeting to share and discuss this information. There was also concern about how much time has been spent on topic 5, and that we were unable to discuss topic number 6 regarding the four questions from our last meeting. Dick gave us the time he felt we needed to discuss this topic, but if necessary can be more assertive in the future with time management. It was suggested he be more assertive and we will “push back” if we feel we need more time on a topic. He will do this at future meetings. It was suggested and decided on that we should add another meeting to discuss the 4 questions and the CMP2 pilot information. This meeting will be January 2nd from 3:30-5:30pm in the Knox Board Room.

Meeting was adjourned.

Upcoming meetings:

Tuesday, January 2, 3:30-5:30pm, Knox Board Room

Monday, January 8, 8:00am-5:00pm, Knox Board Room

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

Tuesday, February 7, time to be discussed and determined