

Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee/Secondary Mathematics

Minutes

February 16, 2018

At 12:15 p.m. Mike Nelson called the meeting to order.

Attendance:

Katrina Zepeda

Liza McNamee

Karen Grossman (guest)

Jason Droesch

Ryan Gillespie

Libbi Keyes (guest)

Matt Werner

Deanne Clifford

Adam Hanan

Trina Caudle

Approve Agenda:

Jason Droesch moved to approve the agenda as presented, second by Trina Caudle.

Discussion:

- Ryan would like the committee to consider a vote of what to recommend on March 5th to allow adequate time for teacher preparation.
- However, four community members would not be able to participate if a vote is made today.
- It's difficult to postpone for members that may or may not show up to additional meetings. It is also difficult to continue pulling teachers out of the classroom for this process.
- Department chairs will need time to work with staff in advance of any changes; ideally they should know by May.

Motion failed 3-5. (Matt Werner, Trina Caudle, Deanne Clifford, Adam Hanan, and Ryan Gillespie voted no.)

Ryan Gillespie moved to amend the agenda to include a content committee recommendation to the Board after item (e) of the presented agenda, second by Deanne Clifford.

Discussion:

- Whatever the vote, it would be good to have a follow-up meeting.
- Will the discussion from yesterday continue regarding the draft plan and timeline?
- The vote may need to address two different items 1) an integrated curriculum, and 2) the fine details or implementation.
- Might want to move it earlier in the agenda.
- Not sure if we have enough community support.
- Would be better to post an agenda in advance about voting on Math 1, 2, and 3, and implementation.

Ryan Gillespie withdrew the previous motion.

Ryan Gillespie moved to amend the agenda to plan a date for the next meeting and a vote. Motion seconded by Jason Droesch. Motion passed 7-1. (Deanne Clifford voted no.)

Approve Minutes:

Ryan Gillespie moved to approve the minutes of February 15, 2018 as presented, second by Jason Droesch.

Discussion:

- Typo noted, the second bullet from bottom of cool feedback should say 'year' not 'word'.

Ryan Gillespie moved to amend the motion to include the noted correction, second by Jason Droesch.

Motion amendment passed 8-0.

Motion to approve the minutes as amended passed 8-0.

Review of Data on Math Completion and University Recognition

- Math completion rates: about 80% of students at CHS and 70% of students at LCHS complete 4 years of math with a pass rate of approximately 88%. However this data does not include transfer credits from

other institutions.

- After researching posted information and calling several universities regarding recognition of integrated math courses (including Yale, Stanford, Harvard, Brown, University of Pennsylvania, University of Washington, University of California, etc.), the general sentiment was that the specific track a student took was not as important as where they ended up their senior year and that they took the most rigorous coursework available to them.

Discussion of Timeline and Draft Plan

- Was middle school work integrated after Big Ideas? No, middle school doesn't use Big Ideas and has been integrated since Idaho implemented the Common Core State Standards.
- Did the Board ask for this to be considered in 2016/2017? The request was earlier. It stemmed from the adoption of Big Ideas wherein the charge was given to look at integrated math in a couple of years. Last year the question arose where we were at in looking at it.
- The committee reviewed the minutes from the Board meeting of June 5, 2017, noting timing issues, particularly presenting changes for the next year in May/June.
- Venture High School's work preceded the infused math pilot by focusing on how students were held accountable.
- We were aiming to focus on curriculum, not meet the needs of a specific test. The result ended up lining up nicely with the SAT.
- Additionally being at the end of the book, data analysis and statistics was often not covered as well.
- A graphic that shows the flow of integration would be helpful. This could support change and show fourth year math options.
- It is important to give students a positive math experience and growth in performance at 10th and 11th grade assessments while also supporting 12th grade coursework. The idea is that changes should support placement into multiple paths.
- Need a back-up plan and assessments for students who don't show SAT growth.
- How do we show growth? ISAT? SAT?
- Idaho has two more years on SBAC contract; afterward the state may switch to a college prep exam only.
- The graph shared speaks to the motivation for the changes and the measurement of impact: this is what it means for curriculum, this is how we support it, and this is how we measure it.
- Show graphically the before and after of restructuring.
- Education Week article on Integrated Math was discussed:
<https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2014/11/12/12cc-integratedmath.h34.html?cmp=eml-contshr-shr>
- Can we pinpoint areas where we agree and disagree? Geometry?
- Will we allocate less time to some content? Yes, but by re-aligning the time would be more impactful by thoughtfully connecting ideas.
- If we aren't getting through the entire course of geometry, how will we still cover the same amount? The concepts of geometry don't need a full year, and a year without any algebra is detrimental.
- It is important that we do justice to the Common Core and the ISAT.
- At this point we need a refined implantation plan. Ryan will work with committee members to clarify information.

Mike Nelson will poll the committee for the next date to meet, possibly Thursday, February 22, 2018.
Meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Submitted by: Nicole Olson