

Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee/Secondary Mathematics
DRAFT Minutes
February 22, 2018

At 7:06 a.m. Sam Hunter called the meeting to order.

Attendance:

Sam Hunter	Matt Werner	Deanne Clifford
Katrina Zepeda	Adam Hanan	Trina Caudle
Jason Droesch	Liza McNamee	Mike Nelson (Ex-Officio)
Kristen Baldrige	Ryan Gillespie	Libbi Keyes (guest)

Julie Amador (joined meeting via teleconference at 7:47 a.m.)
Tambra Pickford (Ex-Officio, joined at 7:54 a.m.)

Approve Agenda:

Jason Droesch moved to approve the agenda as presented, second by Deanne Clifford. Motion passed 10-0.

Approve Minutes:

Deanne Clifford moved to approve the minutes of February 16, 2018 as presented, second by Ryan Gillespie. Motion passed 9-0-1. (Jason Droesch abstained because he had not fully reviewed the minutes.)

Review of Updated Documents

- The latest updates include changes that help to hold us accountable. They include adding specific times during implementation to discuss how we are doing and what to do next.
- Spring 2018 had detail added and changed “products” to “desired outcomes” and then referred the outcome back to the starting point.
- Each layer needed time to plan for how to evaluate and collect data. The specifics of data collection were not detailed, but every stakeholder needed to set a time for determining and communicating how they measure progress, e.g. classroom teachers may have a common rubric for assessment detailing what will be assessed and how.
- We could establish before and after benchmarks for ISATs, EOCAs, common assessments, etc.
- The plan had to incorporate when the information would be determined by.
- Communication might be needed to detail how the Board and community will get follow-up information and reasonable assurance that progress is being made.
- Like the commitment to giving teachers time to work and plan. It provides the opportunity to research and network with other districts making similar changes.
- Higher education could potentially have detail on progress which would give transparency on courses and help determine which classes fill which prerequisites.
- The plan creates a common culture of understanding and assessments that document a pathway to careers and higher education.
- Including examples of anonymous student work will help collaboration.
- It is important to have time this spring to plan. The work will really need to begin in March.

Libby Keyes left at 7:30 a.m.

- The updated side-by-side comparison graphic was reviewed. Time is still spent on topics not assessed on the SAT, but those topics are paired with other topics that complement and enhance understanding.
- This was not built to meet the SAT, but rather focusing on hitting standards and that naturally lines up with most topics on the SAT. The Core Standards and SAT overlay nicely now.
- The topic list is occasionally different as some topics are split into two components, e.g. writing linear

functions was split into linear equations and representing linear equations.

- Teachers need to be meeting regularly for collaboration, including teachers of Math 1, 2, and 3.
- Sometime before May 1st each year we will need to discuss and plan for collaboration the following year.
- Collaboration must also account for new teachers.

Julie Amador joined via teleconference at 7:47 a.m.

- Need teachers to have fall materials when they leave in the spring.
- We should add a single page that captures commitment to the long term; this isn't a one-shot deal, but rather how we will do business.
- Are we committing to both the structure in the implementation plan and integration?
- Will instructional materials adoption be for integrated materials?

Tambra Pickford joined at 7:54 a.m.

- The implementation plan could be a 10 year commitment and integration at least 3 years, but the express intent would be to commit to both integration and implementation.
- Implementation plan is a culture shift that is needed to support math instructional growth. Each part (integration and implementation) fixes different problems, but together they are a comprehensive approach.
- There is concern about whether or not this is truly integrated.
- The language used has created confusion at times, e.g. infusion vs. integration, pilot vs. trial, etc.
- The changes to content in Algebra 1 at CHS included an infusion of geometry topics up to the allowed 25%, but not a full integration.
- There will be a shift in language by calling it Math 1 and noting that it is integrated according to the definition used in Appendix A of the Common Core State Standards.

Ryan Gillespie moved to recommend an integrated approach to high school mathematics as documented in the Integrated Math Scope and Sequence with a three-year rollout beginning with Math 1 in the 2018/2019 school year, second by Deanne Clifford.

Jason Droesch moved to amend the motion to include the implementation plan along with the edits discussed during this meeting, specifically: 1) including and clarifying definitions of integration, 2) added layers of detail for years two and three for all courses, 3) correction of typos, and 4) notation that in three years the implementation plan will continue and the materials adoption will request integrated materials.

Motion to amend passed 11-0.

The amended motion to recommend integrated mathematics passed 9-2. (Katrina Zepeda and Kristen Baldrige voted no.)

The committee will present this recommendation to the Board at the March 5th School Board meeting. Minority reports can be submitted to the Clerk of the Board, Lynn Towne, by next Wednesday, February 28th.

Sam Hunter adjourned the meeting at 8:20 a.m.

Submitted by: Nicole Olson