

Committee member questions and comments are in italics. Staff responses follow, not italicized.

MINUTES FOR ELEMENTARY MEETING OF FEBRUARY 24, 2009

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

Members present:

Jackie Hurd, Teacher, Addison
 Carol Frates, Teacher, Addison
 Desiree Rudd, Teacher, Addison
 Nick Foote, Teacher, Barron Park
 Sylvia Sanders, Teacher, Barron Park
 Cathy Howard, Principal, Barron Park
 Melissa Fassler, Teacher, Duveneck
 Katie Williams, Teacher, Duveneck
 Mangla Oza, Teacher, Duveneck
 Kurt Borgwardt, Parent, Duveneck
 Kathy Chin, Teacher, El Carmelo
 Michelle Haughney, Teacher, El Carmelo
 Katie Kinnaman, Teacher, El Carmelo
 Evelyn Mason, Teacher, El Carmelo
 Stephanie Youngquist, Parent, El Carmelo
 Amy Hansen, Teacher, Escondido
 Amanda Dungan, Teacher, Escondido
 Kristina Sandoval, Teacher, Escondido
 Michelle Robell, Teacher, Hays
 Adriene Farrales, Teacher, Hays
 Jessica Tolerba, Teacher, Hays

Anna Schwarzfeld, Teacher, Hays
 Cindy Schwarting, Teacher, Hoover
 Kevin McAlpin, Teacher, Hoover
 Ginna Brereton, Teacher, Nixon
 Laura Lajeunesse, Teacher, Nixon
 Alison Curtis, Teacher, Nixon
 Kevin Stevens, Teacher, Nixon
 Staphanie Han, Teacher, Nixon
 Bill Overton, Teacher, Ohlone
 Martha Gates, Teacher, Ohlone
 Adrienne Brimer, Teacher, Ohlone
 Lisa Swagerty, Teacher, Palo Verde
 Paula Watson, Teacher, Palo Verde
 Kristin Foss, Parent, Palo Verde

PAUSD District Staff Present:

Lucy DeAnda, Math TOSA
 Magdalena Fittoria, Math TOSA
 Staci Stoveland, Math TOSA
 Becki Cohn-Vargas, Dir., Elem. Ed.
 Ginni Davis, Assistant Superintendent
 Kevin Skelly, Superintendent

Framing the Purpose of the Day

Davis said the original thought was that the Committee was far enough ahead to make a decision, however much passionate concern, and many diverse opinions, had been voiced by parents and community members over how and what children are taught. She said she understood everyone's goal was to make sure the text selected was going to best benefit the District's students for the next seven years. She also validated the tremendous commitment of time and expertise this group of educators and parents has given to this adoption. They have spent countless hours reviewing all the programs on the State adoption list, and discussing strengths and challenges. Davis said she had observed a number of the teachers as they did the piloting and she appreciated their dedication. She then thanked Fittoria and Stoveland for their work. It has been decided to slow the process down to make it more inclusive. Additional meetings would be added to the schedule, a parent meeting would be added, and the presentation to the Board would be delayed by one month. The parent meeting would be held at Nixon on March 12, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. ***(Please note, the date has since changed to March 11, 2009 at 7:00 pm.)*** At the meeting, information would be shared and parents would be invited to comment. Davis said that during today's meeting, observers would have plenty of chances to ask questions.

Fittoria reviewed the anticipated agenda, saying changes may occur during the day if needed. She also reviewed the Committee's meeting norms, and the importance of developing mathematically strong students.

- *Is there a guarantee that the selection will be made by April? There is concern about having enough time for proper implementation.* Davis responded that the recommendation would be presented to the Board on April 14, and it was hoped that the Board would be comfortable with the recommendation.

Fittoria then reviewed the list compiled during a Math Network meeting held in October 2007 regarding what makes a mathematically strong student. She said parents attending a parent meeting at Duveneck developed

Preliminary
Tabulation

a very similar list. The selected math program must help teachers challenge students at all levels.

Stoveland reviewed the ratings after the first round of piloting, which follows:

		Math Content	Content Delivery to Students	Teacher Support	Subtotal per grade
Everyday Math	K	9	8	11	28
EnVision / Investigations	K	11	6.5	7	24.5
Everyday Math	1	11.5	7.5	12	31
EnVision / Investigations	1	13	7	12	32
Everyday Math	2	16	12	13	41
EnVision / Investigations	2	12	6	10.5	28.5
Everyday Math	3	14	10	15	39
EnVision / Investigations	3	15	10	13	38
Everyday Math	4	14	10	15	39
EnVision / Investigations	4	14	10	14	38
Everyday Math	5	11	7	11.5	29.5
EnVision / Investigations	5	16	11	16	43

	Everyday Math	K-5 EnVision / Investigations
Total Score (K-5)	207.5	204
Average	34.6	34
Range	28-41	24.5-43

Stoveland then asked Committee members how they currently felt about each program. They were asked to rate by either “Hot” or “Warm”. This was meant to get a teachers’ gut feelings at this time. The results of the tabulation are shown here.

Grade Level	EnVision / Investigations	Everyday Math
Kinder	3 Hot, 2 Warm	1 Hot, 4 Warm
First	0 Hot, 6 Warm	5 Hot, 1 Warm
Second	0 Hot, 7 Warm	4 Hot, 3 Warm
Third	0 Hot, 6 Warm	6 Hot, 0 Warm
Fourth	0 Hot, 3 Warm	3 Hot, 0 Warm
Fifth	6 Hot, 0 Warm	0 Hot, 6 Warm
Other	1 Hot, 5 Warm	5 Hot, 1 Warm

General Committee member comments:

- *It appears there is some skewing in opinion between higher and lower grade levels.*
- *Was EnVision’s text piloting by all teachers?*
- *What has happened at the middle school level? The Holt series was adopted. Their piloting period was shorter.*
- *Fifth grade’s hesitation with Everyday Math may be due to the fact that it is K-5, so there is a transition between elementary and middle school.*

Committee Meets
by Grade Level by
Publisher

Committee members met by grade level by publisher to discuss the publishers they piloted. The resulting data follows:

		Math Content	Content Delivery to Students	Teacher Support	Subtotal per grade
Everyday Math	K	15	10	9.5	34.5
EnVision / Investigations	K	12	10	15	37
Everyday Math	1	14	9	12	35
EnVision / Investigations	1	11	7	11	29
Everyday Math	2	15	12	15	42
EnVision / Investigations	2	10	6	9	25
Everyday Math	3	16	11	15	42
EnVision / Investigations	3	11	5	11	27
Everyday Math	4	16	12	15.5	43.5
EnVision / Investigations	4	11	6	10	27
Everyday Math	5	7.5	7	10	24.5
EnVision / Investigations	5	16	12	16	44

	Everyday Math	K-5 EnVision / Investigations
Total Score (K-5)	221.5	189
Average	36.9	31.5

Public Comment:

- Zeev Wurman said he had been involved in math adoptions for a long time, and this was the biggest group he had seen. He asked if the texts being discussed were aligned with PAUSD standards for teaching math in fifth grade.

Break

Stoveland observed that the criteria ratings had changed from a virtual wash at the last meeting, to favor Everyday Math now. Stoveland said she had gained much insight from observing the piloting of both texts in the classrooms. She stated that after observing a lesson using one textbook, she often went back to the office to review how the same concept was taught in the other textbook.

She asked that people having piloted one text pair up with those who had piloted the other text (at the same grade level) in order to share experiences, then summarize experiences and share teacher handbooks. She suggested that opinions be supported with detailed evidence. The parents on the committee met separately to discuss their classroom observations and program review. Each group was asked to chart the pros and concerns of each program.

Grade Level Charts

Grade Level	Everyday Math	Envision / Investigations
Kindergarten Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students seemed more engaged Teacher-friendly in explaining set-up, daily routings, lesson set-up, classroom structure Hands-on, real life math Home link booklets Art, literacy, science, music connections Spiral offers opportunity to revisit previous topics in a deeper way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good coverage of 10-frame Investigations adds to program – hands-on piece Students engaged in Investigation lesson Very clearly sequenced between lesson to lesson/unit to unit Covers the main strands of math Multiple assessments available
Kindergarten Cons / Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not have grade level appropriate reading texts Workbook pages do not have enough space Lacks formal assessments Need additional materials/manipulatives (calculators, attribute blocks, white boards) Spiral - too much jumping in early units but was easier as they became familiar with program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Didn't continue with number beyond 10 Too many worksheets (teacher directed) Does not have grade level appropriate reading texts Manipulatives – low quality Advanced learning – too easy Volume of materials overwhelming
1 st Grade Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Models bring depts. To the program (100s chart) Very engaging and challenging Rich mathematical vocabulary Math Message is a good intro to the lesson (well designed) Too much is better than too little (multiple components of each lesson) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good conceptual development within Investigations More depth on one big idea at a time Good for emerging mathematicians Center games were engaging and challenging Incorporated literacy activities Good technology
1 st Grade Cons/ Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are manipulatives included? Spiral curriculum can be confusing Pacing can be too fast for emerging mathematicians Reteaching is necessary for spiral review at times Less support for struggling students ** District-wide implementation needs to be standardized with accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Envision Worksheets are too busy and take away from the math Reading level way too difficult for 1st grade Extensions are not challenging enough Worksheets didn't develop the concept Envision lessons weren't hands-on or engaging Lacking background knowledge
2 nd Grade Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities provide opportunities for rich mathematical discourse Easy to follow for students and teachers Good routines (students always enthusiastic and engaged) Appropriate assessments (length, concepts, etc) More thorough/in-depth exposure to standards Extension easy and natural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worksheets torn out-ready Color visuals Literature/manipulatives included Spiral review/quick checks Interactive/tech component good
2 nd Grade Cons / Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher prep time to get up to speed Pacing needs to be understood/more developed (days for lessons needed_ Need more support with manipulatives/games Needs strong prof. Development, including pedagogy Need more technology components - projectables 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Math vocab not developed – didn't use numerator/denominator Treats math as a sequence of little ideas rather than big ideas (i.e. Fractions too linear, naming versus understanding) Way too easy (lessons went quickly, not challenging, assessments just show regurgitation) Foam manipulatives hard to use Heavy teacher responsibility for differentiation Difficult to follow lesson plan – integration with investigations not good
3 rd Grade Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depth then developing concept (prob. Solving, probability, manipulatives, different models – set, region, area,- embedded differentiation and accessibility and pre-assessment Kinesthetic opportunities (grab bag, using students' materials, whiteboards/slates) Math Msg. Good lesson kick-off One single complete teacher manual (all on CD also) Consistent format through the grades 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good conceptual beginning with Brownies in Invest. Good vocabulary (vocab cards) in Envision Included three fraction models (area, set, bar (region) (like ruler) Investigations: more problem-solving, kinesthetic learning, conceptual approach

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home link follow-up helped connect homework to class (embedded in lesson) Real life connection (multiplication – map scale, array/fraction museums) Parent letters – good info/explanation of concept/homework answers 	
3 rd Grade Cons / Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have to slow down the pace Need to be comfortable with program format Time for inservice to be comfortable with program format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not engaging for advanced learners Difficult to sequence because joint usage plan is not specific (ex. When to insert lessons) Two whole separate programs, plus all of the materials are overwhelming (pulling from both teacher and student materials) Three models covers <u>only</u> superficially No number line model Time needed to coordinate two programs effectively Envision: rote practice, textbook dense, “boring”
4 th Grade Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concept of a varying whole is reinforced right away Practice with multiples and factors integrating into fraction lessons All kids were challenged (7-1 and 7-2) Student Journal p. 342-343 Discovered computation without teacher direction Had to use manipulatives to understand concept/process – high and low kids 5/6 of 24, 1/2 of 10 Differentiation options very clear and concept-based Games were used to build concepts Workbook pages easy to use Good for new teachers to understand concepts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-existed with Investigations (concept-building) Quick checks nice with writing component Assessments for Investigations are good – require to prove answer
4 th Grade Cons / Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If not using software, lots of books to copy from, reference Standard algorithm as a <u>project</u> in green section at back of book and in extra book/skill book Are manipulatives included? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No practice with multiples and factors In one lesson – 2 strategies were given (fraction strips and using algorithm) but then practice require standard algorithm Lots of sources to use Took out Crazy Cakes Plan 2 only takes out one lesson from Envision Has games but just reinforces skill not concept/process (just more practice) Juggling a lot (to balance Inv. And Envision) and all resources (Toss and Talks, Quick Checks, POD, Int. Problem...)
5 th Grade Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One program Games were useful and connected (ex: factor captor) On-going assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quick checks were good assessments User-friendly for kids and teachers Visual learning animations were great review Quick images in Investigations Lots of group work Very hands-on Deeper embedded problem-solving More lessons on each topic rather than more topics Assessments were easy to create and adapt Hands-on components in both Envision and Investigations Stressed mastery (ex: volume-doubling, halving, discovery of formula)
5 th Grade Cons / Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extremely hard to navigate Has a lot of stuff that is not addressed in our standards – volume by displacement Teacher-unfriendly Hard transition to sixth grade Limited hands-on activities (ex: volume – 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were some editing problems Need to use <u>both</u> the Envision and Investigations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ little discovery such as nets) ▪ Not much practice ▪ Problem-solving not embedded ▪ Spiraling was too broad and too much for kids ▪ Student reference book not at their reading level ▪ Project California is an add-on, should be part of the program 	
Parent Reps Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student reference book: usage is taught at beginning; using reference book is a good tool ▪ 5th grade: interpreting the remainder lesson provided for good discussion and understanding ▪ Consistency of use of pattern blocks to build understanding of fractions (what is the whole) from 2nd to 3rd grades ▪ Good vocabulary in newsletter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 4th grade: Dividing area Investigation into different fractions enabled good understanding, good extension ▪ 5th grade: prime factorization investigations was well presented, and stimulating for children
Parent Reps Cons / Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Newsletter may be too dense ▪ Need reference books at home for children who don't have computers ▪ First year of usage can be confusing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No guarantee teachers will use both programs ▪ 5th grade Investigations: use of net did not link well with volume doubling exercise ▪ 4th grade Envision: 45 problems just having to put symbol (< > =) between two fractions ▪ No showing of work or explanation ▪ The game with the lesson was same

Stoveland shared with the Committee that there were three additional components Everyday Math that had just arrived the day before. They were an Operations Handbook, Assessment CD, and Skills Link Workbook. Stoveland asked that during the lunch break, Committee members review the charts completed so far to watch for trends and to note any burning questions that had arisen. She also mentioned that the parent representatives have a great insight because the teachers let them into their classrooms, which is appreciated. She then noted that if the parents made any negative comments based on their classroom observations, it was not because of teaching, but rather the actual materials.

Public Comment:

Public comment was invited, and there were no requests to speak.

Fittoria said sample home letters for each text were available to community members. In addition, flyers for the March 12th parent information night meeting were available at this meeting and on the website. ***(Please note, the date has since changed to March 11, 2009 at Nixon at 7:00 pm.)*** The flyers had already been sent out to all schools and were to be included in newsletters.

Lunch Break

Skelly said he had appreciated observing this meeting, and added that giving teachers the best training was crucial to the education of the community's students. He asked attendees to share what they have learned thus far with their colleagues at their sites before a final decision is made. Skelly said adoptions were great opportunities to have professional conversations among colleagues. He wanted staff to consider opportunities to build further conversations during the summer, and during the following school year as implementation of the selected text began. He reminded the group that they were a set of teachers joined in a common mission, and that student experiences should be consistent across the District. He believed that having the same materials supports consistency. Regarding manipulatives, he said that a full set of tools was needed for whichever text was adopted and the District intended to provide all materials.

Fittoria reviewed the revised meeting schedule, explaining that the group would present a report and recommendation to the Board of Education on April 14th. Around the time of the March 16th meeting, which could be slightly longer based on the group's needs, MARS testing would also be occurring. The parent information meeting would be held on March 12th ***(Please note, the date has since changed to March 11, 2009 at Nixon at 7:00 pm.)***, and it would be great if Committee members could attend to help share

Next Steps and Meeting Dates

Committee Meets
by Grade Level –
Both Publishers

information. It was also recommended that Committee creating an implementation plan based on the textbook recommendation, however this could change, depending on progress today. *If people cannot attend the March 16th meeting, will their voices still be heard?* Stoveland said that in the past, people who could not attend submitted information to her in advance to be shared with the group. *Committee members thought the list of dates they were given in the beginning of the process was fixed, so they planned their calendars around that list.*

Fittoria asked that people divide up into groups by grade level to discuss questions that had arisen and need to be answered before a decision on the program to be recommended can be made. She also noted that a great deal of input had come in generalizations, whereas she needed specifics in order to respond. It was stated that we will try to take these questions, and their answers and post them on the web. Stoveland read the questions submitted during the brainstorming session:

- How do we support multi-age classrooms/school?
- Can we get materials into teachers' hands before summer?
- Can we have two years to adopt?
- If Everyday Math is adopted, how will the 5th grade cover the missing pieces (algorithms, etc) to prepare for 6th grade?
- How can we support 5th grade Everyday concerns?
- Help us understand the disconnect in 5th grade Everyday Math.
- What would 5th grade teachers need to make Everyday work for them?
- If 5th grade feels a particular component is missing, could that be supplemented with other materials?
- How do we make "Plan 2" of the joint usage more user-friendly?
- How could we generate a uniform EnVision/Investigations implementation at all sites?
- Did everyone pilot Investigations? If not – could they use the three weeks to try out that component?
- If EnVision/Investigations is adopted, what kind of accountability will there be to make sure teachers are using both?
- What is feedback from other districts regarding Everyday Math and how students were impacted by upper grad implementation?
- What accountability will there be to ensure that full implementation is taking place?
- Will the District create a useful Joint-Usage Plan at each grade level for implementation of Investigations and Envision?
- If we were to adopt Envision or Everyday Math, are we prepared to recommend an implementation plan to support all of us as new teachers and new teachers to the District?
- What should I be teaching for the next three weeks – Everyday Math? Envision/Investigations?
- How do you deal with colleagues that are so resistant to change that they fail to see the value in a new program?
- Could a summary of pros/cons for both programs be provided to us so we have consistent info to present at our school sites?
- How can we design District training to capitalize upon specific areas of strength and needs of each particular teacher?

In response to some of the questions,

- Stoveland said the law said that there were two years to adopt a text, and that by September textbooks must be in the classrooms, unless there is a waiver. This is now the second year of the process at PAUSD. *Perhaps the question was whether there could be more time for piloting, or more time for implementation. With a second year of piloting, more people might "get on board".*
- Fittoria said that materials would be ordered as soon as a decision was made and adopted by the Board. The distributor would be told that teacher texts must be available before the end of this school year.
- *Can teachers keep the texts they pilot until a decision is made? And can they keep their texts, if adopted?* Skelly said this next three weeks was the chance for teachers to continue with piloting and share with staff. *If Everyday Math is selected, not only would teachers need all the texts, but also the CD.*
- *If possible, more time should be taken to make this decision, since the speaker was not involved during this entire two-year process.* Fittoria asked what kind of information he would want in order to

make this decision. *Three weeks is not an optimum number, and if the District can take another year, he would prefer this.* Skelly said he believed the question is whether or not this process can be postponed. He wanted to honor the work of the people who had already put in a great deal of time on this, however he would like to know the legal answer to this question. He also suggested that, as fifth grade teachers were not comfortable yet, they ought to continue piloting, including the long division algorithms section. He also advised they meet with other fifth grade teachers to get their opinions on both texts. DeAnda added that long division algorithms were included in both texts, because they were state-mandated.

- Fittoria said there was some confusion in Everyday Math with the national program and the current third edition being presented to PAUSD for consideration.
- Regarding the question about sharing of information produced at this meeting, Tina Allen, who is taking minutes, would be transcribing all charts, etc. and would provide draft minutes in the next few days.
- Regarding use of EnVision and Investigations together, some teachers had issues with mismatched page references. Others preferred to pilot just one text or the other. Fittoria said she believed prior discussion had been that EnVision and Investigations would be used together, and if chosen, would be implemented together. The District would need to create a joint usage plan superior to Pearson's.
- Regarding Everyday Math, there are also considerations regarding publisher support and how to transition. *It seems like the philosophies of the two choices are very different. Can teachers from other districts who use these texts be invited to speak to the group?* Stoveland said this had been discussed and if the group wanted, teachers with Everyday Math experience can be found. Envision, however, is new. *March 3rd is currently an open agenda. Can part of the time be used for teacher presentations? There are also teachers at PAUSD who have used these texts at previous districts.* DeAnda said it is important to make sure that these teachers had used the same edition this district is considering.

K-5 Committee –
Whole Group
Discussion

Stoveland suggested people group by grade level to discuss what they would do during the next three weeks.

Skelly said he used to be a math teacher, and he just had a textbook with no extra materials, so teaching had come a long way. It needed to be made clear that Everyday Math approaches material in a different way than other standard texts. He said that in the last adoption, some people chose one text and some used another. He saw this adoption as a chance for people to come together to have discussion that provided more light than heat. He hoped that by the end, all staff would buy in to the selected text. He also hoped some parents would participate in the March 12th discussion. ***(Please note, the date has since changed to March 11, 2009 at Nixon at 7:00 pm.)***

Third grade agreed to continue the pilot they were currently in the midst of.

Second grade decided to map out what five lessons from each text would look like, then try them on their classes, then report back. Stoveland asked if they would like a sub day to plan. Yes.

First grade said they would just continue to pilot Everyday Math.

Stoveland said she asked the Everyday Math consultant how students not coming in at kindergarten would learn how to use the text. The sales rep said the readiness lessons would need to be used.

Kindergarten would try another more advanced unit in Everyday Math. In addition Investigations would be tried in EnVision.

Fifth grade said they were willing to keep looking at Everyday Math and most would keep using it for the next three weeks.

Fourth grade would continue working with the texts each teacher had chosen to pilot.

Skelly said he hoped conversations at the sites would continue. He was also interested in having the fifth grade conversation continue. Davis said it had been suggested that as teachers continued to pilot, parents be kept in the loop, and that their feedback be solicited. Skelly also suggested parents be invited to observe

Preparing for Implementation

lessons. Stoveland said she would be asked teachers if they would be willing to open their classrooms to parent observations. Parent feedback could be forwarded to Stoveland. Fittoria and a summary would be compiled using results from this discussion as well as additional references.

Stoveland said there had been various suggestions for teacher training on the chosen text, such as summer training and staff development. Fittoria asked teachers to discuss with their peers how they envisioned an implementation plan for each text. This can include summer, number of days, structures, and support needed at the sites.

Has March 3rd been clarified yet? Stoveland said she believed that would be determined once implementation ideas had been gathered.

Grade level groups discussed implementation.

Public Comment

Xenia Hammer said she had kids at Duveneck, Jordan, and Paly. She thanked the group for working so hard, saying a strong solid math program was very important for elementary kids. The solidity of the program would also help close the achievement gap. Kids with no resources at home had to be considered as well. She had served on the middle school math adoption committee, then spent a lot of time looking at the elementary math texts. She did not strongly favor either text. She also had strong concerns about Everyday Math, from a parent's perspective:

- Spiral organization method is confusing
- Can children achieve mastery in this?
- Can parents help their children if they have trouble?
- Emphasis on non-standard algorithms may cause kids to struggle with mastery of basic concepts
- Are there enough practice problems and problem-solving practice?
- There is a great reliance on the calculator.

Zeev Wurman said Hammer had touched on many issues he was also concerned about. He said it was important to ask about implementation. There must be an upfront plan so the community would not question it, especially for Everyday Math, because it is new. He said teaching standard algorithms was very important, and the District should pay attention to this.

Groups shared their findings:

First grade hoped to use March 3rd to observe classroom in other district using the texts, such as Mountain View.

Third grade suggested the April PDC day be used to discuss the adoption and implementation and make sure everyone is on board. They also want a commitment from administrators that the focus will be the learning of math for all teachers.

Kindergarten suggested moving the April PDC day to May or June to introduce new math materials.

Stoveland said April was considered a late PDC date already. Stoveland asked how many staff felt a later date would be acceptable. Staff responded that a date after STAR testing would be acceptable. *Other suggestions from the kindergarten group included: having a choice between early summer and late summer training taught by teachers not reps requiring a Math Lead at each site to train teachers; break outs for grade levels; time to plan lessons together/prep materials; time to talk (after looking at program manuals); representative from publisher to introduce program (methods, approaches_ sample lessons with teachers; staff meeting time to focus on math at each site; and a two-year commitment to focus on math at each site.*

Other comments included: EnVision has a week-long training in San Jose this summer to train math leads. Staff development day choices should be based on teacher needs, possibly offering three different choices. Make sure administrators support a focus on math. Would like materials over the summer and a paid staff development day during the summer. It was also suggested that the August staff development not be used day for math. Davis said the union had negotiated the August staff development day with the District. Whether it is school or site based could be discussed, as could differentiation. Use March 3rd to continue to

explore the math in our classroom. We would like a lesson study approach training for professional development. Immerse yourself in the materials, look at a continuum of a concept across grade levels (and within a grade level), cluster or site-based review of materials.

Additional comments about professional development:

EnVision/Investigations	Everyday Math
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Create a correlation guide that explicitly integrates the two programs (huge undertaking) ▪ Sessions on using technology ▪ How to effectively differentiate and meet all levels of learners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality time with expert reps ▪ Experienced teachers who have used/are using Everyday Math ▪ Optional paid summer institute ▪ Optional session on accessing technology/using Everyday Math with smart board ▪ Grade level and separate individual planning time ▪ Required manipulatives

Stoveland asked if there was a preference for the timing of a summer institute. The group appeared to prefer a two to three half-day training course in August.

Final Thoughts

How did this slowing down of the process all evolve? Were e-mails involved? Stoveland said that in the past few days, a number of parents had sent e-mails saying they wanted a chance to give input. *Why has this just happened in the past few days?* Stoveland said that when the committee was forming, staff had posted invitations on a number of websites and in newsletters, and only four parents asked to join the committee.

Public Comment

Dana Wong said she grew up in Palo Alto and graduation from Paly. When living in Rochester, Everyday Math was started when her son was in second grade. She and her husband often could not help him with his homework because it was abstract and confusing. If parents cannot help their children, how can the children understand it? If Everyday Math was adopted here, parents would need to learn it too, which would mean additional work. She said the teachers in the Rochester school were also very frustrated, as they were not allowed to bring in supplementary curriculum. She was afraid the difficulty of teaching this could cause the District to lose staff.

DeAnda said for March 3rd the options were to plan, use the texts in their classrooms, or to observe. If they were going to be out of the classroom, they could use subs.

Stoveland said the planning group would now debrief, then send out an e-mail stating what the plan would be.

Staff Googled "Everyday Math" there were a lot of negative comments, though they may be based on the older text. There was not much at all on "Envision". Stoveland suggested that people make sure they are reading about the California version.

If staff doesn't take a sub day on March 3rd, can they have a longer meeting on the 16th? Or possibly push the March third slot to March 16th.

Stoveland said the 16th might be changed to a whole day.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Adjournment