

K-5 MATH ADOPTION

PALO ALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Date: 3/16/09

Committee member questions and comments are in italics.

MINUTES FOR ELEMENTARY MATH ADOPTION MEETING OF MARCH 16, 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
Cathy Howard, Principal, Barron Park
Lee Ann Constant, Teacher, Barron Park
Pamela Dappen, Teacher, Briones
Melissa Fassler, Teacher, Duveneck
Katie Williams, Teacher, Duveneck
Mangla Oza, Teacher, Duveneck
Kurt Borgwardt, Parent, Duveneck
Esther Yoon, Teacher, Duveneck
Kathy Chin, Teacher, El Carmelo
Katie Kinnaman, Teacher, El Carmelo
Michelle Haughney, Teacher, El Carmelo
Nan Knoblauch, Teacher, El Carmelo
Gaelyn Mason, Teacher, El Carmelo
Stephanie Youngquist, Teacher, El Carmelo
Amy Hansen, Teacher, Escondido
Amanda Dungan, Teacher, Escondido
Kristina Sandoval, Teacher, Escondido
Susan Hoff, Teacher, Fairmeadow
Michelle Robell, Teacher, Hays
Adriene Farrales, Teacher, Hays

Anna Schwarzfeld, Teacher, Hays
Jessica Tolerba, Teacher, Hays
Cindy Schwarting, Teacher, Hoover
Ginna Brereton, Teacher, Nixon
Stephanie Han, Teacher, Nixon
Alison Curtis, Teacher, Nixon
Kevin Stevens, Teacher, Nixon
Mary Pat O'Connell, Principal, Nixon
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:

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

Observers Present:

Melissa Baten Caswell, Board Member
Chris Kennel, PA Weekly
Mandy Lowell, Parent, Jordan/Paly
Mary Medoff, Duveneck
Zeev Wurman, Community Member

Purpose of the Day

Stoveland said she appreciated the presence of all the teachers, because this was a busy time of year.

Skelly said that since the last meeting, a lot of activity had occurred. He said one thing he emphasized at the parent meeting (held at Nixon on March 11, 2009) was the importance of listening to parent comments. He said everyone came at math from their own past experience. He then recapped a number of the comments he made at the parent meeting.

When he was a kid, he did not like math. He also had believed that if he was good at math, he would automatically be a good math teacher. He later learned this was not the case. There were many people who weren't as good at math as he was, but they were much better teachers. He noted that the District has a very strong math program already, although he is interested in developing a more consistent K-5 curriculum. He also spoke about the Strategic Plan, including differentiation, academic excellence, and meeting the needs of every child in the classroom. He also wanted to make sure that during this process, special attention was paid to the input of the teachers. He said one question raised at the March 11th meeting was whether or not the adoption could be delayed. He said it could, however a large amount of time had already been put in, and he believed it would be difficult to delay it and expect the same interest from committee members. Ultimately the Board would have to make a decision on this. All Board members were in attendance at the parent meeting. At the end of the meeting, he had asked everyone to give a "fist to five" rating on the texts, meaning people were to

use a 0-5 rating system. Responses varied, with some people content with the decision of the committee, others wanting more information, and still others wanting their votes to determine the ultimate choice.

Norms

Fittoria presented the agenda for the day, thanking members of the planning team for the time they spent crafting it. She said they planned to develop professional responses to inquiries from the community. She then reviewed the meeting norms and the agenda for this meeting.

Grade Level Groups Discuss and Report on Continued Piloting

Stoveland suggested the groups take some time to debrief on any new discoveries they made during the past three weeks of piloting.

Results of the discussion follow:

Kindergarten

- *Everyday Math*
 - *Tried center cards with parent volunteers.*
 - *10-frame.*
 - *Counting objects.*
 - *Counting/grouping by 5's.*
 - *Ability grouping.*
 - *Easy to adjust activity up or down.*
 - *Easy for volunteers.*
 - *EM activities lend themselves to discussion/going further and deeper.*
- *enVision / Investigations*
 - *Tried more EnVision/Investigations lessons for numbers 1-10 and 10+.*
 - *No debrief/discussion (EnVision).*
 - *No mathematical student-to-student interaction (EnVision).*
 - *With Workbook (EnVision) pages, everyone is doing same activity (not differentiation for higher or lower students).*
 - *Many new Investigations activities were the same as old.*
 - *Some of the student sheets (Investigations), game boards, etc were clearer or new.*
- *General Comments*
 - *Many lessons in EM are very similar to Investigations activities.*
 - ** The major difference is that the revisiting is built into EDM!!! The lessons go deeper from unit to unit.*

First Grade

- *Teacher observed a Mountain View school teaching Investigations / enVision*
 - *K teachers said not enough hands-on activities and concrete experiences.*
 - *K-4 tends to use only Investigations curriculum and supplement with other stuff (but don't really use enVision).*
 - *Fifth grade had positive experiences with sequencing.*
 - *Teachers said there was not enough differentiation within the curriculum (enVision).*
- *Lessons using calculators (Everyday Math) were not replacing basic fact memorization, but rather adding insight (i.e.: place value pattern) to math.*

Second Grade

- *We are still unclear which would be better for new teachers. (EM probably would be easiest to supplement.)*
- *Either program will need some "adjusting".*
- *EnVision needs a better "road map" especially to coordinate with Investigations*
- *Everyday Math needs supplementing of drill/practice – even in addition to "skills link" booklet.*
- *Everyday Math is more supportive of differentiation*
- *Understanding brain research behind this is essential for "buy-in" to program. It shows importance of spiraling. It exposes kids to concepts over time and multiple times*
- *EnVision without Investigations is too easy.*
- *Will everyone actually use Investigations?*

Third Grade

- *Everyday Math*
 - + *All one program*
 - + *Flashcards (triangle for mult/div, add/sub)*
 - + *Games help students practice facts (ex. Beat the Calculator, Baseball Math – computer version)*
 - + *Multiplication *Units 4 and 7) Assessments included many different opportunities for students to show their learning. Facts families, word problems, input/output charts, open ended.*
 - + *Slate assessment (ex. of informal way to check)*
 - + *“Learning in Perspective” pages provide links to the past and future → learning road map*
 - + *One unit leading into upcoming unit.*
 - + *Last Math Boxes page in each unit has pre-assessment questions for next unit.*
 - *Parent felt that this would help kids with standardized tests.*
 - - *Fractions assessment was difficult, open-ended, but given basic fraction questions students would do well.*
- *EnVision/Investigations*
 - + *Workbooks were easy for parents to understand and follow.*
 - - *Combining two programs would be challenging to figure out because of instructional overlap with models and strategies.*
 - - *Different teachers approach the two programs differently; lack of consistency.*
 - - *There would have to be a specific plan/document that integrates the two programs. Need District to follow through to be sure teachers are following it.*
- *Teachers will supplement materials where needed, no matter which text is adopted. (worksheets, games, flashcards, timed tests)*

Fourth Grade

- *Everyday Math*
 - *Engaging activities and games.*
 - *Entry points felt high at times (i.e. Intro to fractions, Unit 7, equivalent fractions in first lesson assumes they mastered this in 3rd grade.)*
 - *Math Messages were clear and easy to use and Reflexes were effective, adhered well, and had three distinct tiers for different level students.*
 - *Conceptual learning is very developed and makes students learn the process, rather than just product.*
 - *All level of students are reached and pushed.*
 - *Sometimes teachers wanted more practice but there is another portion of the program available that was not available during pilot. (Need “Skills Link” and “Operations Handbook”.)*
 - *Teacher did not feel she needed to supplement the text.*
- *EnVision/Investigations*
 - *Some teachers continued piloting EnVision/Investigations.*
 - *Interactive Learning Problem was good problem-solving.*
 - *Investigations and games were good for tiered (leveled) groups, but not as effective if done just at the end of the lesson.*
 - *Investigation assessments were good because students had to explain their thinking.*
 - *Books gave teachers ways to extend the lessons but the extensions were not that challenging for top students, Everyday Math was more intuitive for extending.*
 - *Liked Quick Checks with writing*
 - *Enrichment pages could be used by all students and potentially as homework, though were not challenging enough for highest students.*
 - *The extensions were sometimes too simplistic., Teachers could often start with the extension. (ex. suggested to start with 3x5 array and extension was 4x12)*

Fifth Grade

- *Everyday Math pilot was continued focusing on fractions.*
 - *Very rich in models (positive and negative). Judicious use. Is it too much? Did it reach every child? So much time could be used that kids wouldn't become proficient in any of them if teachers don't use time judiciously.*
 - *Pacing still a concern.*
 - *Math Messages were rich and led to much deeper conversations.*
 - *Concern over teacher competency and the text could be very workbook oriented so staff development is critical.*
 - *Textbook is language-oriented with a high reading level. Intense.*
- *EnVision/Investigations*
 - *Investigations unit on fractions was very strong, but also similar to Everyday Math ("Name that Portion" TERC lesson – more fun, more of an entry level). Three for three wanted to do Investigations unit.*
 - *Too many components.*
 - *Many lessons similar to Investigations. (not as strong)*
 - *Sequencing was frustrating at times.*
 - *Editing issues (errors).*
 - *Problem-solving in division stronger than previous and than observed in Everyday Math.*
 - *Not as many components so more manageable.*
 - *6th grade teacher felt after reviewing the materials that EnVision/Investigation would better prepared students for middle school.*
 - *Middle schools are adopting Holt but also using Connected Math.*
 - *For fifth grade teachers, won't get kids who have used spiraling for five years. How should they handle that?*

Debrief March 11th Parent / Community Information Meeting

The group reviewed draft minutes, notes, and parent e-mails from the March 11th meeting. Stoveland said some of the parent e-mails asked very good questions. She said that during a recent Principals' meeting, the depth of work being done was described.

Davis passed out a few emails for parent/community members. One teacher commented that the last e-mail in the packet was very biased and her account of the evening was not always true and contained errors. She had also been very disrespectful to teachers on staff.

Stoveland gave the group time to read and discuss minutes and e-mails. She also suggested teachers try to separate feelings on individual people and focus on their comments, questions and concerns. The following comments resulted from the discussions:

- *At the 3/11 meeting, an overview was given on past committee work, and she had forgotten about a lot of it. She was really impressed by the amount of work.*
- *Was reassured that parents and teachers really do want the same things for their kids.*
- *Parents are really afraid that some of the more ambient programs come at a cost, such as use of calculators. At Palo Verde, math practice is very explicit and includes weekly assessment tests. Parents need to understand that math practice is a continuing process.*
- *The District may need to consider something to be used as a touchstone for parents; built in communication, especially during this transition.*
- *Communicate to parents focused on what the programs are about is important, and rather than just including opinions, more clear communication is needed. There is a fear of the unknown.*
- *Information that is helpful to parents regarding international competitiveness and California standards test scores should be provided to parents.*
- *One parent helping in a classroom thought both programs were good, but the most important thing was the teacher.*
- *A woman stood up at the end of the March 11 meeting and asked for a vote on the two programs, saying they were at opposite ends of the spectrum. This is not true, although they are not identical. Everyday Math is more teachable.*
- *There is a huge difference between just reading the materials and actually teaching the curriculum to students.*

- *Some communication about teaching techniques has always been necessary. Many parents really just want to know that teachers will be comfortable with whichever program is chosen, because they have faith in teachers.*
- *During the March 11 meeting, a parent said she wanted her students to learn math the way she did, so she could easily help them when they came home.*
- *It is important to help all levels of students reach new deeper understandings of math using an innovative program.*

Community Input

Zeev Wurman complemented the committee, saying the group had also been complemented many times for doing this work and that they were benefiting from extraordinary staff development in doing this. Regarding the issue of opinions and misunderstandings, he stated that research shows spiraling is accepted as ineffective because teachers do not teach to mastery. For memory retention, “space learning” should be used because mastery is taught the first time, then concepts are reviewed periodically in the future. He said to be careful in separating accepted supported techniques with those that are not.

Small Study Groups to Review Key Questions

Stoveland suggested the group divide into smaller study groups to discuss a few of the issues brought up by the community. She asked that information be recorded and cited on flipcharts. She then reviewed the list of discussion questions found on the back of the agenda and asked groups to discuss them and report back. The discussion questions, as found on the back of the agenda, follow:

1. Calculators in Classrooms
 - a. Are calculators used in enVision / Investigations? If so how?
 - b. What does EDM say about calculator use? Put a post-it on pages to be photocopied.
 - c. How are calculators used in EDM? Give specific lessons in which they are used and how it enhances / weakens the overall objective of the lessons.
 - d. How many lessons in each grade level use calculators?
2. How are Multiplication and Division Algorithms and alternative strategies addressed in EDM?
 - a. Use Suz Antink’s analysis as a starting point.
 - b. Outline how multiplication and division are developed in 4th and 5th grade. Cite specific lessons and put a post-it on pages to be photocopied.
 - c. List resources available to a teacher to help develop algorithms.
 - d. Cite how District Standards (x / \div) are addressed in EDM.
3. How are Multiplication and Division Algorithms and alternative strategies addressed in enVision and Investigations?
 - a. Use Suz Antink’s analysis as a starting point.
 - b. Outline how multiplication and division are developed in 4th and 5th grade. Cite specific lessons and put a post-it on pages to be photocopied.
 - c. List resources available to a teacher to help develop algorithms.
 - d. Cite how District Standards (x / \div) are addressed in enVision / Investigation.
4. Read the Executive Summary of the Final Report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel
 - a. Indicate the implications for our work.
 - b. Highlight significant findings.
5. Singapore Math – Recapping Analysis
 - a. Choose a grade level (or perhaps one upper and one lower grade).
 - b. Review our initial criteria forms.
 - c. Continue to use the criteria to evaluate and cite specific evidence. Put a post-it on pages to be photocopied.
 - d. What parts of Singapore did the committee like?
 - e. Should the committee further review and/or look at the curriculum as a supplemental resource?
 - f. Are there parts that could be incorporated into professional development as a resource? If so, which ones?

It was agreed that the group would take a lunch break, then report out on their discussion afterward.

Lunch Break

Study Groups Report Out

The groups reported out to the full committee:

National Math Advisory Panel Report is lengthy and had a lot of guidelines. The question regarding implications for our work is most important. A streamlined approach is important, and the District's teaching standards make this difficult. Both programs address the general recommendations of the panel in the areas of conceptual understanding, computational fluency, and problem-solving skills. One thing the group discussed was pre-K readiness, and Everyday Math had more opportunities for addressing this. The most important piece no matter which text is selected is implementation. Professional development will be a key piece, no matter which program is adopted. Very important to boost teachers' mathematical content conceptual knowledge.

The calculator group said there were just a few calculator lessons for each grade in which for focus of the lesson was on calculators. Some calculator use during games as well. For example, students play a game called "Beat the Calculator" in which they try to answer basic facts faster than the calculator. Games are repeated throughout the year so it appears that the use of the calculator is more prevalent than it really is. One example for calculator use was in Kinder and First grade in which students explore the concept of one more /one less. For some homework assignments, calculators were not allowed. On the homework pages, a symbol for no calculators is indicated. In the teacher's reference manual, there are several pages regarding calculator use.

Singapore Math group found there was a simple layout on the bar model, not visually overwhelming. In addition, it had a pictorial glossary and concepts were broken down. Weaknesses: very teacher-directed, not much student inquiry was promoted, not much parent communication included, limited problem-solving with open-ended results, no writing about thinking, heavy on multiple choice, and not a lot of space for work at some grade levels. Is there software? Spiral progression mentioned in teacher edition could not be found in text, no way to address misconceptions, and no direct suggestions to facilitate mathematical conversations.

The multiplication/division algorithm group said Investigations used models (arrays) to teach understanding of the concept. Students have exposure to strategies like partial products, distributive property, arrays, and estimation. Investigations curriculum wants students to understand what the algorithm notations represent – why it works. Strong intro – multi-digit multiplication at 4th grade; 5th grade review. EnVision begins with rich student interactions and hands-on conceptual activities that are related to concepts taught in the chapter. Estimation is strongly incorporated, embedded, and utilized throughout. Multiplication strategies for division are initially used, then money models before the standard algorithm. 4th grade enVision uses array/tables, expanded algorithm, partial products, then traditional algorithm to teach multiplication. 5th grade reviews and builds on these concepts.

The Everyday Math group found that in fourth grade there was a mother load of multiplication lessons, practice, resources, and explanation for partial products, lattice, and the standard U.S. algorithm (short algorithm). In fourth grade, students were introduced in third grade to lattice and partial products. Algorithms were extended to work for decimals and fractions. There were lots of practice pages and triangular flash cards. The program was very rich and provides resources for all kinds of multiplication. In fifth grade, students were taught the lattice method, and that it is not a "trick". The operations handbook and skills link provides additional practice with the standard algorithm.

Skelly noted that it was 1:00 p.m. and the meeting needed to end by 3:00 p.m. The group needed to move along in order to achieve a recommendation. This adoption matters, but not as much as the teachers and their work in the classroom do. He said one option was for the committee to present its research, then ask the Board to decide, but he did not support this. He then tried to summarize by saying that if this group was working in a vacuum, it appeared the committee would likely select Everyday Math for its richness and program quality. He had heard concerns from teachers, parents, and others such as: spiraling vs. space learning and the ability of parents to help students at home.

He said he believed implementation of Everyday Math less difficult than EnVision/Investigations. He also believed there was an excitement about Everyday Math that would help build enthusiasm. Another option would be to pilot another set of materials. He felt the group had already checked that out. He also believed that changing this process now would be a mistake. He said his children did Everyday Math for three years. In Poway School District a big question was how to provide staff development in Everyday Math for teachers coming in who were used to the standard algorithm. He said he thought the best recommendation would be to move forward to adopt enVision/Investigations now.

Committee Comments:

I agree, but we know that the teacher, more than the curriculum, makes the biggest difference in the classroom. We should choose a program that really helps teachers teach math. It sounds as though, while it would be easier to select enVision, Everyday Math would better support teachers in teaching.

Are we doing what is best for students and what teachers want? Or are we just giving in due to politics? What is the percentage of parents who are against Everyday Math? I spent time with two parents who were against Everyday Math, and by the end of the time, they were OK with it. I know of no other parents who are complaining about it. I can't believe we are going to give in and not get the best for our students in order to make it easy.

I am disappointed because much of the resistance to Everyday Math was about misconceptions, and I wish I could have better explained my opinion during the March 11 parent information meeting.

If you are going to give us a new program that might be controversial, please give it to teachers early, not in September.

I met with a lot of the new teachers, and many are discouraged by the thought of adopting enVision/Investigations. As a brand new teacher, Everyday Math would be easier to learn to teach, because it is one program. There should not be a concern that new teachers can use Everyday Math if the District is hiring the best and the brightest staff. I would have a problem if my children started drinking or smoking because they were concerned about being beaten up.

I have never felt as excited about teaching something until I piloted Everyday Math. I felt as though with enVision/Investigations, I lost my excitement again.

At the first meeting, Skelly had said we all need to be on the same page. If we go with enVision/Investigations, teachers will continue to not be on the same page.

Teachers put their heart and soul into teaching. They are in a partnership with parents to get the best for their children. If this process results in recommending enVision/Investigations because there is community disagreement, it does not feel respectful. If there is disagreement, I would prefer to work on the education piece and possibly extend the process.

I feel shell-shocked, in part because Skelly wanted consensus at grade levels and across the whole group. It was understood that if the group consensus was made, all teachers, even if they did not choose the text, would work as ambassadors to the selected text. I hope the choice is not taken away from this group. I read a lot of reports and blogs over the weekend, and saw that concern was expressed about spiraling curriculum and fluency in algorithms. What was the point of this morning's discussions then? I would not want the group to feel it was coerced into making a decision. I Feel very downhearted at the moment.

I hope Skelly said what he said to promote discussion, not because he actually felt this way, because the group's work should be honored, rather than thrown out because of community opposition.

Skelly said teachers are more important than the adoption, and he understood that people would feel his comments were not supportive of teachers. On the other hand, he did not want to spend eight more months on this discussion. While the District was just able to increase salaries, he did not know if the District could afford staff development for a new text in future years. He doubted that accepting

Everyday Math would be easy for the Board. He wished it wasn't a decision around politics, but in a way it has to be. The committee needs to support what ever is done, but on the other hand he didn't want the community to be fighting about this. Regarding consistency, teachers and principals are in a better position to determine this. There is also a question about what is best and where time should be used. He then asked what would help the group move forward on this topic.

When we did the program evaluations, whether or not the Board would accept the group's recommendation was not part of the criteria. Quality of the program was the main consideration, not the opinion of the community and the Board. If Everyday Math is adopted, parent education and teacher professional development would be necessary. One thing I enjoyed about this District was that it was bold, and decisions were made based on best practices.

Other parents I spoke with were very reassured by the depth of work this group had done and by the professionalism of the members.

I thought Skelly misspoke when he recommended enVision/Investigations. If Everyday Math is off the list, this committee might want to consider other publishers.

I find this disheartening, because it feels like focus has been taken away from the two programs being considered and transferred to community issues. Now the decision-making process is being bogged down by other issues.

I would almost be prepared to suggest starting over, and putting curriculum back up for consideration. This could be a committee consensus, and at this point the committee needs to get together to make a recommendation.

I don't understand what is happening. Very healthy discussions about two different programs have occurred. Can't the group move on from this to work toward consensus and stick to the original timeline?

I feel like this process is not even finished. Now it seems like the group is starting over due to community comments, which feels very unfair. In the future, teachers will not be willing to give their time to projects like this. It feels as though teachers are not being respected.

I feel untrusting now because the decision is being taken away.

Why would parents think teachers would be making a decision that is not in the best interest of their children? I am in this job because I really love it. The U.S. may be slipping in math, but it is not PAUSD students.

The number of parents not showing trust in this committee is very small.

90 - 95% of parents do trust teachers here. Only a small percentage of parents in the community do not respect what teachers do and think they know better.

We have all noticed it is a small percentage of parents and community members who have concerns. At the March 11 meeting, my small group contained a number of community members who did not have students in this District. The row that has come up during this adoption pales in comparison to the prior one, when teachers pushed through their choice and were successful in the adoption.

Skelly said he welcomed the thoughts of the Committee.

I am very disappointed that Skelly is not standing up for the committee and for the process it has gone through. He may have insights into the Board's views, but he still needs to stand by the committee.

Skelly said support meant working through and giving advice and getting to the right solution. He did

not think which text was adopted mattered that much in the long run. In the overall scheme of the children's experience relies more on the quality of teachers.

I have taught here for eight years and have trained a number of new teachers. Many new teachers felt site support was key to teaching anything new. It has been exciting to watch teachers walk in not knowing a new text, then being excited by seeing it work in the classroom. It would be wrong for someone to value research results on a website over actual classroom experience. The group should say as a team that it will be a support network for the adopted text throughout the District. This would create a powerful movement to help teachers be better educators.

Everyone in this group is saying they are willing to make Everyday Math work.

Literacy training took a lot of professional development and the program has been very successful. This is the same hope I have for this adoption. I hope teaching will be done in a more consistent way. In addition, a tremendous amount of work and energy has been put into this process.

Stoveland said she had gone back and forth in this process between the two texts. The group should look at parents concerns and address each one. Calculators are a concern, and she believed this had been considered today. No program is perfect, and the group needs to look at which one is the best fit for Palo Alto and its philosophy. The calculator isn't used as heavily as some think, but even if it was, staff could tell teachers to not use that part of the program. This would be the same for algorithms, which could be supplemented.

Skelly asked about conversations at the sites.

Hays teachers presented both sets of materials, including pros and cons, stressing that no matter what is adopted, the reason it is chosen and the program itself needs to be communicated to the community. There is a difference in language, because methods and terminology may be different from how parents learned math in school. This can be remedied with clear communication.

Duveneck committee members presented both texts to the other teachers at the site, who made it clear they would fully support whichever text the committee chooses.

A discussion occurred at Addison, and staff there support the decision of the committee. They trust this group. This was the same for a majority of the other elementary sites.

At Nixon, conversations with other teachers have been about this process and community backlash. Other teachers have also shared that community backlash and the lengthened timeline were reasons why they did not want to be on this committee.

At Palo Verde, a parent said parents can learn a new vocabulary, so the fact that parents have not seen some of the words in the new texts before should not affect the adoption.

Either way, the elementary math program will remain strong. As Skelly said, it might not matter to students which text is adopted, but what about the damage to this process? I can live with either text recommended by my colleagues, but I have a hard time backing something selected for another reason.

At Hoover, two teachers piloted texts and spoke at staff meetings. There was support for whichever text was adopted, and disappointment was voiced because the timeline was extended. I have an extensive mathematical background and have worked with the Noyce Foundation. I really feel the teachers in the group have to be listened to.

Skelly said that as a Superintendent, it was his job to convince people to do things, and that he had colored this conversation. He asked how many people, before he spoke, would have recommended adopting Everyday Math and how many would have chosen enVision/Investigation. Only six committee members would have selected enVision/Investigation out of thirty-seven committee

members.

I came today ready to support what the committee decided. I am also concerned that the questions of the fifth grade teachers have not been addressed.

Fifth grade teachers used the additional three weeks for piloting, and their findings have not even been addressed yet.

Cohn Vargas said this was the largest adoption group she had worked with. She suggested another 15 minutes of discussion, followed by a secret ballot vote. Looking at implementation and staff development could possibly shift some votes.

Discuss Two Possible Scenarios in Small Groups and Share Out Findings

Group discussion on the two possible scenarios listed on the front of the agenda follow:

1. If we were to adopt enVision and Investigations:
 - a. How would our students and teachers benefit from using enVision instead of CA Mathematics? Please be specific and cite examples. Put a post-it on pages to be photocopied.
 - i. *EnVision is much more building from concrete to abstract.*
 - ii. *Had more hands-on components and more problem-solving.*
 - iii. *Students are encouraged to talk with each other.*
 - iv. *Interactive learning provides daily problem-solving.*
 - v. *The enVision had valuable games.*
 - vi. *There were a lot of tech components and tools for teachers to use.*
 - b. How would our students and teachers benefit from using the newest version of Investigations instead of the current version? Please be specific and cite examples.
 - i. *In the hundreds chart, highlighting the hundreds chart, students had to write the problem and the answer, whereas before it was just the answer.*
 - ii. *Assessment tools asked mathematically complex questions that required students to explain their thought process.*
 - iii. *The new Investigations units are more teacher-friendly and worksheets are more easily accessible.*
 - iv. *There is now more of a balance between computation and problem-solving.*
 - v. *At fifth grade there is a stronger lesson on prime factorization.*
 - c. What are the concerns?
 - i. *General inconsistency between the two programs.*
 - ii. *Teachers will likely choose one text or the other, not both.*
 - iii. *It was too easy for many students. Too much on the page.*
 - iv. *Not challenging enough.*
 - v. *The lessons are too short.*
 - vi. *Still had to develop work to challenge higher math learners.*
 - d. What are the implications for an implementation plan?
 - i. *If done, a very good roadmap will be needed and the administrators will need to hold teachers to it. Principal support, and accountability.*
 - e. What are the implications for professional development to ensure an effective implementation?
 - i. *It is close to what is being currently done, so teachers may continue exactly what they have been doing. They may feel that professional development isn't needed, but it is.*
 - ii. *Need supplemental materials. More professional development will be needed because there are two texts.*
 - iii. *Thorough training opportunities will be needed during the summer and early next year.*
 - iv. *Focus will be needed on differentiation and on engaging students at all levels.*
 - v. *It will also be important to teach students why things are done a certain way.*

2. If we were to adopt Everyday Math:
 - a. How would our students and teachers benefit from using EDM instead of CA Mathematics and Investigations? Please be specific and cite examples. Put a post-it on pages to be photocopied.
 - i. *Ensure consistency across the District.*
 - ii. *Depth starts early.*
 - iii. *Having everything in one manual.*
 - iv. *Teacher's manual outlines professional development opportunities.*
 - v. *Conceptual learners.*
 - vi. *Understand the process.*
 - vii. *Allows students to apply knowledge more.*
 - viii. *Electronic resources are much stronger than California Math.*
 - b. What are the concerns?
 - i. *Too many components for students.*
 - ii. *Not as many hands-on components.*
 - iii. *Entry points for 4th grade lessons assume students have mastered certain concepts they may not have been taught yet.*
 - iv. *Parents need to know the District is monitoring the usage of tutors and the amount of time students are being tutored and are working with parents.*
 - v. *The student resource book is difficult for kids to interface with at the 5th grade level.*
 - vi. *Some lessons are over two hours long and there isn't enough time in the day.*
 - c. What are the implications for an implementation plan?
 - i. *If teachers don't use the program correctly, it could be a lot of worksheets.*
 - ii. *We haven't had a long piloting to see spiraling.*
 - iii. *For an implementation plan, a way needs to be developed to be sure children are mastering concepts, possibly with District wide assessments.*
 - iv. *Parent education.*
 - d. What are the implications for professional development to ensure an effective implementation?
 - i. *So many components in every lesson, children are transitioning multiple times, which is a challenge for children with focus problems.*
 - ii. *Professional development should be linked to assessments too.*
 - iii. *Materials need to get to teachers early (before summer).*
 - iv. *Part of professional development needs to teach how the program articulates across grades.*

Concerns specific to Fifth Grade:

Concerns about transition to middle school for Everyday Math. The transition is too big.

Cohn Vargas asked if there were any other options people would like to suggest.

Have we considered doing Everyday Math in K-3, and Investigations/EnVision in 4-5?

Can fifth grade go with middle school adoption? Holt is a 6th – 8th grade series.

Is there a problem with fifth grade just doing enVision/Investigations?

I have looked at both fifth grade programs and would be willing to go with either program that is chosen. I have no problem supplementing, as I already do this. A number of other teachers agreed.

Is one of the options that teachers could use either program? Fittoria observed that teachers appear to be flexible. Stoveland asked if the group was saying they equally like both programs, or if they do have a preference.

I want Everyday Math, but I want to make sure fifth grade gets what they need too.

Skelly noted that the six people wanting to adopt enVision were all 4th and 5th grade. He said that both programs could not be adopted, and asked if Everyday Math was selected, these teachers would accept it. *They said they would want their concerns noted, and would support whatever program was adopted.* Skelly said he wanted to make sure all teachers would use the adopted text, whichever one it was, for the sake of consistency across the District. *It appears fifth grade doesn't dislike the Everyday Math program, but that it does not fully prepare 5th graders for 6th grade, so this would need to be addressed. Implementation will be a lot harder if it is forced, and there is no buy-in.*

Cohn Vargas asked what the group thought of the idea of using Everyday Math for K-3 and enVision/Investigation for 4-5.

- *The programs are very different*
- *A 4th/5th grade teacher would not want to teach enVision if K-3 students were learning with Everyday Math.*
- *At Ohlone, 4th/5th is team-taught, so if different texts are used, it would definitely have to be a k-3/4-5 split.*

Stoveland asked if the 5th grade concern was around multiplication and algorithms. *This has been addressed and I am no longer concerned.* Stoveland asked if teachers would be comfortable saying which areas were not covered and the District had to get supplemental materials for those areas. *In reviewing the fractions unit, 5th grade teachers' concerns were alleviated by looking at the 4th grade curriculum guides.*

For second grade, it would be hard to deal with enVision's little sheets of paper, and I would supplement with a math journal. There is also not enough depth.

For the secret ballot, there were three choices: Everyday Math K-5; EnVision/Investigations K-5; and Everyday Math K-3 and EnVision 4-5. If you don't have a second choice, please do not write one on your card. Secret ballot results:

| | Everyday Math | EnVision/Investigations | Everyday Math for K-3 EnVision/Investigations for 4-5 |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|---|
| First Choice | 32 | 6 | 0 |
| Second Choice | 0 | 12 | 11 |

Community Input

Mandy Lowell said she was really sorry that she had posted comments that were not favorable to Everyday Math. She never meant to be disrespectful to teachers and this committee. She had come to the last meeting and was very impressed by the conversation. She thought people were mostly split between the two programs. She wished this dialog had occurred sooner. Everyone shares common goals, and most parents want all the things for their children that teachers are discussing. They don't see this in Everyday Math, and they are concerned that spiraling will not allow children to learn concepts the first time around, thus making more work for teachers the next time around. She asked that teachers show parents the richness they are talking about, because it does not seem to appear in the books parents look at. Some concepts do not seem to be covered in depth and are not covered again and reinforced. Lowell said no one wanted to overrule the committee's judgment. She had thought two programs were on the table and that the pros and cons of each were still being discussed. She said she would try to post on the blog how caring and dedicated this group is and how deep the discussion has been.

Next Steps

Davis said staff had a clear notion of how to go forward. These voting results will be brought forward at the next meeting. Professional development is a huge portion of this adoption, and it would occur in June and in August. Committee members and other teachers not involved in this process would be combined during staff development. Principals need to act as facilitators for all these conversations.

When the decision is made, when are the pilot materials due back? In the past people have held on to them until the Board approves the text. At that point, Stoveland will e-mail teachers. Piloting materials for the approved program would be kept, while the others would be returned to the publisher.

The first Board meeting will be April 14, 2009, followed by another Board meeting on April 28, 2009.

Closing Remarks

Fittoria said she taught in Spanish Immersion for eight years, and that having a mixed age classroom taught her about teaching to a range. She said it had been an honor to be part of the process, and she respected every teacher at this meeting. She still had high expectations for students and teachers. And parents had to feel they were true collaborators.

Cohn Vargas acknowledged the work of the TOSAs (Teacher on Special Assignment) during this time.

Skelly said the next month would still require a lot of work, and that he would support their decision. He said he believed in the committee and the work the teachers were doing. It was the work of teachers more so than the adopted text that would make for a strong math education program.

Adjourn

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