

MINUTES FOR ELEMENTARY MEETING OF JANUARY 28, 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
LeeAnn Constant, Teacher, Barron Park
Melissa Fassler, Teacher, Duveneck
Katie Williams, Teacher, Duveneck
Esther Yoon, Teacher, Duveneck
Mangla Oza, Teacher, Duveneck
Kurt Borgwardt, Parent, Duveneck
Katie Kinnaman, Teacher, El Carmelo
Michelle Haughney, Teacher, El Carmelo
Nan Knoblauch, Teacher, El Carmelo
Debbie Hilleary, Teacher, El Carmelo
Stephanie Youngquist, Parent, El Carmelo
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
Nancy Pang, District Office Technology
Becki Cohn-Vargas, Dir., Elem. Ed.

Goals and Norms for the Day
Revisiting the Context/Lenses

Breakout I: Grade Level by
Publisher

Breakout II: Grade Level –
Both Publishers Combined

Meeting norms were reviewed.

Grade Level	Everyday Math	Envision / Investigations
Kindergarten	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 min. per lesson max • Home/school link booklets & letters • No homework • # games • No manipulatives (book of games) – extra • Real-life experiences with math 	<i>Pilototed using Envision only</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45-60 min. per lesson • Parent letters • Homework booklet with 3 levels of act. • Ten-frame/# combinations • Some manipulatives (foam) – children ate them – chewed on • Mostly worksheets
1 st Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confusing sequence • “Choppy” • Breadth without depth • Games K-6 excellent • Differentiation not easy – directed teaching • Concept development was difficult • Reference Kids’ book – (difficult for navigation) • Fun, exciting – kids very engaged • 80-90 minutes • HIV • Good Assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed concepts within same bid idea • Vocab tied together • Spiral review • Focused games based on lessons • Differentiation too early • Lots of reading (difficult for ELL) • Consumables • Standards • 80-90 minutes • HIV • Good Assessments
2 nd Grade	<p>Teacher Friendly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need time to get to know parts • Student teacher used successfully • Directions easy to follow • Need your own manipulatives?? <p>Student Friendly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kids liked it • Pages uncluttered • Reference book was popular • Accessible and challenging for all <p>Differentiation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities rich enough for kids to differentiate on own • Natural opportunities for teacher to differentiate/extend/remediate 	<p>Teacher Friendly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sometimes difficult to follow TE instructions • Integrating <u>Investigations</u> confusing • Teacher has to make own extensions <p>Student Friendly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Way too easy • Pacing not appropriate (too slow on some topics) • Very busy pages <p>Differentiation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher has to supplement • Games – all students did “Challenge” version (too easy) • No good pre-assessment
3 rd Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follows same pattern for each lesson • Games were very rich • Good differentiation (embedded) • Student Ref. Book was useful – kids liked it • Good pacing but one lesson spans more than one day • Heavy on materials (back and forth between books) prep takes a lot of time • Really great math 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two programs supplement each other well (neither is stand-alone) • Coordination can be awkward/difficult • Presents multiple strategies • Interactive support materials were god • Hard to predict pacing • Math workshops were good for both adv. Kids and opportunity to catch up
4 th Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial Product and lattice • Enrichment was strong • Some manipulatives • “All in one” deck (complicated to use every time) • Electronic text easy to use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial products and standard algorithm • Lots of manipulatives • Quick checks • Enrichments • Interactive problems, games
5 th Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time-consuming • Games – adequate; support materials – not enough • Structured lessons but with learning curve • Not all math vocab used or discussed • Not always aligned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible – adaptable to needs • Games and support materials strong • User friendly • Appropriate use of math language • Enrichment activities engaging

Breakout III: K-5 Groups by
 Publisher

Everyday	Envision and Investigation
<p>-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – Mental math did not match – the lesson – nor did the problems • 5 – Not enough story problems; math boxes took longer than they should • 2, 3 – Confusing that pre-assessment ?'s were in math box – until they realized those were <u>pre</u>-assessments • Very expensive – consumables • 5 – Sometimes enrichment did not relate to the topic • 3 – Too much to read during piloting; will need manipulatives; needed to redo score sheet • Will need an agreement to all use it • 5 – Not enough homework (parent complaint) • Parent – would need reassurance why fewer problems in homework • K – not enough math or differentiation • K/5 – Not engaging • 5 – Difficulty during transition for student who did not have it in prior year • 5 – Worried about sending answers home • K, 1 – It felt like there was a lack of continuity, not well-connected; didn't allow for differentiation • 2,3 – Had to adjust pacing; different from the book. Some lessons did not have clear pacing. • K-5 – To use all materials in a lesson; requires many transitions. Would be very hard for some students. Could be part of a learning curve, with materials. • Rearranging is hard and should not have to be done by new teachers • K – No manipulative for piloting • 2, 4, 5 – Took lots of teacher time to learn components <p>+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 – Enrichment pages, suggested in teacher guide • 2,4 – Top students felt challenged; middle level felt challenged; struggling/needing more time benefited from journal • 1-5 – Home links; journal, assessment were clear and 3easy to take/assess • 1-5 – easy to implement hands-on activities for working with small groups at different levels • 1-5 – Good teacher p.d. in math • K-5 – Need 100% buy-in at all grade levels for implementation • 2,4 – Impressed with finesse of mathematics: Combining \$; 10s; time well; 1-5 games taught concepts • 2,3 – adjustable pacing; ?? – <i>Will pacing and # of components in a lesson get easier with a full adoption?</i> • 3 – Every lesson had a similar arc and components • K,1,2,4,5 – Lots of routines available; valuable for new teacher • 1-4 – Math Boxes manageable # of problems; assessment/review – 2 pre-assessment on each page • 2,3 – Kids loved resource book • 1,3 – Kids loved math time, games • 1-4 – Engaging for all levels • 3 – Math very good in multiplication; ¼ size versions of themselves • 4,5 – Novel and multiple algorithms; used these to move to traditional • K-5 – Great parent communication and at-home ideas • 1-5 – Electronic teacher guide and PDFs for smartboard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade levels used different plans for piloting. (Plan 2 clearer) • K – no hands on/<u>liked</u> intro to 10-frames • Too many word problems in primary grades (difficult for EL learners too) • Daily spiral review • CD-Roms/software useful • Flexibility within program • More resources for differentiation (games, quick check) • Assessments available (quick check, open-ended, mult. choice, test generator CD) performance base • Enrichment was not challenging (K, 1, 3, 2) • Similar to what we have now

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

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

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.