

Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee/Secondary Mathematics

Minutes

February 15, 2018

At 11:33 a.m. Mike Nelson called the meeting to order.

Attendance:

Katrina Zepeda

Jason Droesch

Matt Werner

Adam Hanan

Deanne Clifford (arrived 11:45)

Liza McNamee

Ryan Gillespie

Trina Caudle

Karen Grossman (guest)

Libbi Keyes (guest)

Tambra Pickford (Ex-Officio)

Lisa May (Ex-Officio)

Approve Agenda:

Trina Caudle moved to approve the agenda as presented, second by Ryan Gillespie. Motion passed 7-0.

Approve Minutes:

Jason Droesch moved to approve the minutes of February 7, 2018 as presented, second by Ryan Gillespie.

Discussion

- Strong opinions were shared about whether four years of math should be required. Should they be reflected in the minutes? The minutes are not an exact transcript of discussions, but should cover the general discussion. They can be amended if detail is not sufficient.
- Does “require four years of math” mean to take and pass four years? Yes. Credit would need to be earned. This highlights the potential difference between state and local graduation requirements, e.g. the state only requires three years of math.

Motion passed 7-0.

Discussion

Analyze the draft plan for implementation that was developed by a cross-district team of math department heads, building administrators, and representative teachers. In order to improve equity (hear all voices), efficiency, and focus, we will use a protocol that will include three rounds: 1) clarifying question, 2) warm feedback, and 3) cool feedback.

Clarifying Questions

- Standing agenda items at building meetings, can we coordinate those with other content meetings? Yes.
- CHS pilot – how is this data normed and how will it be made sense of? It is mostly experiential.
- Checkpoint assessments, who will be writing them? The Preliminary Math 1 Team
- Define small in “small” assessment. Assessments will be variable because some units are lengthier, but on average 8 – 10 questions is the thinking.
- Assessment sharing at Math 1 retreat, will that be results analysis or feedback on content covered? The agenda would be built to include either/or depending on the need.
- Will a summary of pilot feedback be provided to LCHS and Venture? (to be covered in feedback)
- Is the assumption that this includes three consecutive levels over three years and that it would continue beyond 2021, or might it potentially be overhauled then? The document was built to target best practice but should be seen as a living document.
- What is the CHS pilot? Infusing geometry content into Algebra 1, similar to Math 1, but not fully integrated.
- Some data will be shared to the district level, and administrators, e.g EOCAs, and summative data. Intent is not to scrutinize test results in a way that might encourage teaching to the test. The assessment should inform instruction.

- Is collaboration the only time that departments share information? Yes. Would private virtual discussion boards help dialogue? Possibly.
- Are there plans to involve external agencies? The Math Shell center does have professional development, but the preliminary Math 1 Team is in-house.
- How are Math 1 teachers identified, and what happens if they teach different courses next year? This is a building decision that results from conversations between department chairs, assistant principals, and principals. Try to keep consistency whenever possible.
- What is the TRU Framework? It includes five dimensions of powerful classrooms. Follow link below: Link for TRU Framework: <http://map.mathshell.org/trumath.php>
- Identifying 8th grade students for ALP/Math 1 will change. An 8th grade teacher is needed for representation in that discussion.
- Middle school and Venture representation not present. Middle school representative has been unable to attend. Ryan has been working with them individually.
- How will we work with underprepared faculty? (to be covered in feedback)

Warm Feedback	Cool Feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to identify timing; varying amounts of time • Deadlines; check-ins are valuable • Like accountability for administrators • Repeatable process that could be replicated in Math 2 and Math 3 • Curricular and assessment materials will be in hands of teachers by specific dates - especially the end of the semester • Using collaboration time to review assessment results; going in with stated goals • Having common preparatory periods • Meets the need for facilitators in leading collaboration • Common assessments guide the conversation • Common assessments can be compared year-over-year • Instructional components are emphasized • Intentional time together that is focused on this need for improvement • Honors teachers with additional pay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we make sure that this work influences other mathematics teachers? • How will the choice to grade/ungrade assessments (at discretion of the teacher) be perceived? • We need to gather the data necessary to ensure that the reform is causing improvement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ More structure of data collection for checkpoints/check-ins <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase detail in this area • Keep minutes and agenda with processes to analyze the data • We need to provide a visible balance of assessments and a way for the community to see growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ More detail/transparent in this area • LCHS/VHS need to know more detail of the CHS pilot • Consider consistent grading practices • Need to consider advanced learners in potential plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ How do we provide access to advanced coursework? • Need to address onboarding of new staff into the approach • Need to also include a review of Math 1 into the second year; calibrate efforts • Need parameters around what should be included in the EOCA?

General Feedback:

- Does this plan address both pathways - how does this affect an “integrated” approach?
- Need to provide the plan as quickly as possible to Math 1 teachers
- What about vertical alignment of all mathematical faculty?

Lisa May left at 1:20 p.m.

Tambra Pickford left at 1:25 p.m.

- It is difficult to embrace the idea of deconstructing and reconstructing Big Ideas. What if ‘we don’t know what we don’t know?’” The three years process could be far bumpier than we anticipate.
- Are we comfortable moving forward together on integrated math?
- Do we need to do this before our new superintendent is here?
- But how do we support our teachers now with the work that is and needs to happen in the classroom?
- A hold-up might be on the time frame of the plan.
- Without common assessment already done how do we know if changes are successful?

Liza McNamee and Trina Caudle left at 1:30 p.m. Quorum no longer present. Mike Nelson adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by: Nicole Olson