DRAFT

MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH TEXTBOOK REVIEW
MEETING MINUTES
FOR 1/22/07

Committee members in attendance: Keith Barber, 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, 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.

Opened the meeting with review of the work of the day. The committee's work today will be to make a preliminary recommendation (to the extent that we can), and/or clarify how the committee feels about both curriculums. Theresa Tsou and Monica West will also share some information in their presentations to the committee. We will have time for discussion of these 2 presentations, and will also discuss the middle school teacher's presentation and forum on Feb. 1st.

Members were asked to look at the list of filters generated at the 1/8/07 meeting, and rank their top 5 filters. Lists were turned in to Dick. He will tally the results and share the results with the committee later in the meeting.

Minutes from the meetings on 1/2/07 and 1/8/07 were reviewed. One change was requested on the minutes for 1/2/07 meeting. On page 1, bullet number 7, the second sentence should read: "This class included a wide range of student abilities from low to medium-high level." Minutes for the 1/2/07 meeting were approved with this one change. Minutes for the 1/8/07 meeting were approved with no changes.

Theresa Tsou thanked the committee for allowing her the time to present her data. She presented data as pertained to a broader, statewide look at WASL scores . The Powerpoint presentation will be available on the district website, or from the K-12 Teaching and Learning office. Dick asked for comments or questions concerning the presentation. One member commented that the JMS CMP2 class that was referenced in the presentation was not a pilot, but was a teacher requested supplemental purchase, that the students in the class were not level 3-4 based on their grade standards, that it would be difficult to compare this data to other classes, and that there was no teacher training for the class teacher. Another comment was that we tend to use our own upbringing and experience to evaluate what may be right for our children, but we need to be cautious and look at research concerning how children learn. The comment was made that the 6 topics that may not get taught in CMP2 (based on time limitations), are currently not being taught with Glencoe. Another committee member questioned where the data was gathered from regarding the OSD's 7th grade being 20th in state ranking. The current data they have seen showed that WMS was ranked 28th and RMS was ranked 111th. Some members expressed concerns over the presentation and that how the data was presented may not be reflective of all sides of the data issues. With regards to skipping books in

CMP2, one teacher currently doing a pilot said that most books cover 4-5 investigations and continue to come back to the same concepts. Classes can skip books and still get all the concepts. Fractions are not just in the 6th grade books, they are taught throughout each book. There was concern expressed about putting students in tracks, and later trying to move them to a different track if they excel. It may be difficult. There are disadvantages with a spiraling curriculum for higher level students who may get bored with repeating concepts again, and also for unmotivated students who may feel they will get the concept again later, so why learn it now. The comments was made that the presentation did not present any compelling data regarding why we should adopt McDougal-Littell, only why we should not adopt CMP2.

Monica West shared a presentation on the use of McDougal-Littell's Activity Generator. The software is easy to use. There are different activities for each lesson. Each activity also includes the answer key, teacher notes, common errors, and activity closure questions. These are whole class activities. The activities are good, easy to access in the software, however there was not significant differentiation in the activity levels (as there was in Holt). On the C version there are 1-2 higher level thinking questions; otherwise there was not significant difference. Examples of different activities, and different levels were passed around to the committee members for them to review.

Tricia received an email from a member unable to attend today's meeting. He had requested a voice in today's meeting. Tricia asked the committee if she could read the comments from his email. The committee agreed, and she read the contents of the email as follows: "*I believe that the members of this committee have a common concern; in a statewide comparison the Olympia School District performs above average in math and to switch learning strategies puts our success at risk.*

It is my impression that families with students having high ability and high support are especially concerned, and rightly so, because math has been taught according to their learning style. It is also my impression that if we are to adopt a CMP approach, those students will likely still have access to a traditional approach to learning math. But, what about the students that already is not succeeding? Many of them do not have high ability, involved parents and are faced with reinforced frustration in learning math. For these students a change in strategy is needed. There are a large number of these students in our district, also as our test scores show.

An engaged student learns. The district needs to move in the direction of teaching math to all learning styles in a format that encourages inquiry and open ended problem solving that will engage students in their learning. A consistent result of the CMP approach, that I have heard in the committee meetings, is that students are engaged and are enjoying their math classes, even in spite of low attendance and lower ability issues. I believe the goal of improving math education in the OSD lies in helping all students become engaged in their learning. The need to supplement materials and the training to meet this goal will persist whether a CMP approach is adopted or a traditional model is maintained and I look forward to discussion that extends beyond the textbook." Dick asked for further discussion regarding either presentation. The comment was made that concerning Bellevue School District's funding, we don't know how it is used, so it would be difficult to evaluate whether their increased funding went to support math. Another member said that in the Board presentation from Bellevue S.D., it was stated they did use

some of the grant funds to bring in additional staff for supporting math instruction. One member asked what Bellevue S.D.'s free and reduced lunch statistics were in comparison to our district. They average 10%, and are similar to our stats. A committee member commented that the additional release time that Bellevue S.D. has is based on them starting earlier each day. They add ½ hour to each school day.

Dick shared the profile of filters results. There were 23 respondents, and 4 of the 20 filters received more than 10 votes.

- Has balance – problem solving, critical thinking, applications, basic skills – *received 15 votes.*
- Aligns with state standards – *received 13 votes.*
- Retention of knowledge for students – *received 13 votes.*
- Ability levels – meets needs of various levels of learners – *received 12 votes.*

The following filters each received 7-8 votes:

- Student interest/response
- Professional development
- High school prep – transition
- Data driven
- Addresses the issue of lower performing students

Every item received a response from someone, and 3 people wrote in a comment about the need to consider gender balance.

Dick posed the following questions: Is it possible for our committee to reach consensus today for a recommendation? Failing that, should be take a vote? A vote to recommend a curriculum would require a 2/3 majority. Concern was expressed with regards to making this decision today based on the change in the meeting date (because of snow) and the inability of some members to attend due to the change. We want the decision to be fair and made respectfully and with integrity. A final decision will attempt to be made on Feb. 7th. If consensus, or a 2/3 majority cannot be reached, then the committee will present a profile of both texts and the committee's process to the School Board. Even if we don't have a recommendation to take to the Board, we do need to reach consensus on the items to include in the profile made to the Board. We do not want inaccurate information to leave here. If a profile is presented to the Board, it will be up to them to decide how to proceed from there. If no consensus is reached today, then we will present information about both curriculums in the middle school teacher's meeting and community form on Feb. 1st. One member expressed that they felt consensus by the committee was unrealistic.

Dick asked for the committee to focus the discussion on the two books. One member asked the high school teachers to share which book would best meet their needs in preparing kids for high school. A comment was made to also consider that 3 of the 5 high school teachers are not present today. One high school said he feels that the middle school teachers' opinion is more valid. The other teacher shared that she feels kids need to be responsible for their own learning, and CMP2 provides this, however she is concerned about content in CMP2. She feels the content is not there, and that McDougal-Littell is solid in the area of content.

The committee was asked to compare the pros and cons of each curriculm based on our chosen filters.
Comments concerning *Has Balance* are as follows:

- CMP2 encourages the critical thinking component of math instruction. **There was group consensus on this comment.**
- Basic skills is more supported in McDougal-Littell.
- CMP2 has all 7 strands, and McDougal-Littell is strong in the numeric strands.
- There are differences in balance for each of curriculums.
- McDougal-Littell is better in teaching how to use the "tools" needed in math.
- Based on a comment from a high school teacher at a prior meeting, retention is a current problem for kids. 40% don't have basic skills coming into high school, and many kids have not retained concepts they were taught.
- The committee values the views from the middle school teachers.

Comments concerning *Aligns to State Standards* are as follows:

- CMP2 aligns better, but the alignment is deep and so requires a great deal of teacher commitment to find and utilize.
- One member commented that he doesn't think balance or alignment to state standards are that important. Teachers just need to know how to effectively teach.
- There are numerous standards, and we have to choose – do we teach deep or broad – we can't do both.
- We have to look at how kids learn. If one curriculum has an approach that facilitates higher retention, we have to look at that.

One committee member commented that he has had experience in teaching CMP, in teaching other curriculums and in training teachers, and he would be disappointed if we don't hold on to what is already working and successful in OSD. But, he also is concerned about the 30-40% of students who aren't successful. They need to be engaged and excited, and CMP2 can provide this with its pictorals, hands-on approach, etc. Another member commented that she is frustrated that we are looking at the majority of kids, and not looking at ways to support the lower level kids. A member who is piloting CMP2 commented about the concept of students teaching themselves. She said that based on the CMP2 training she received last summer, she is able to guide students in their learning more than ever in her classes. The kids may not realize she is directing their learning, but she is orchestrating the process of their learning. The question was posed as to whether we could adopt multiple texts within the district. Adopting multiple texts would be difficult and financially unrealistic. Teachers would gravitate to what is easiest and most comfortable to them, and new incoming teachers would want the option of ordering what works for them. There is not a way that the district or schools could finance this, and it would cause difficulty in placing students in classes from year to year.

Dick commented that it is obvious we will not reach consensus today, or on Feb. 7th. On Feb. 1st we will present both curriculum to the middle school teachers and the community. We will gather the information we get from these meetings, and come back on Feb.7th to try to make a vote decision. **As we go to the middle school teachers' presentation and community forum it is important that we not force our decision or**

opinions on parents or teachers by giving them information out of context. We should not represent our personal points of view to the public. Who is interested in helping with the presentations on Feb. 1st? Kate Trafton, Theresa Tsou and Julie McDougall will work on it. Kelly Pankau may be able to help, but is unsure. There will be Powerpoint presentations to aid the presenters, and the bulk of the time will be available for public comments.

Meeting adjourned.

Upcoming Meetings:

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

Wednesday, February 7th, 3:30-6:00pm, Room 301