

Math Adoption Committee Notes

October 29, 2009, 4-7, Baker Room at WISC

Present: Lorinda Flikkema, Andrew McMaster, Calista Shelkin, Sarah Wallick, Rachel Yaeger, Jillian Sorenson, Jackie Horst, Kirk Kreiling, Joey Libolt, Rebecca Vena, James Peterson, Dallas Evans, Genevieve Guinn, Sally Raftery, Linda Thornberry, Janey Andrews, Steve Blatt

Absent: Aaron Adsit, Tracey Franck, Jeff McCabe, Megan Neelands, Steve Mackie, Andria Quarry, Jana Sparks, Lilia Kol, Lori Stutsman

Sharon started the meeting at 4:07 pm, introducing Kathee Terry as the note-taker and time-keeper. She gave the group the agenda for the meeting using a PowerPoint presentation which is attached (link here).

We will begin every meeting with the district mission to remind everyone of our purpose and context, followed by the core values for secondary math curriculum adoption.

Website introduction by Steve Blatt.

- Homepage includes district mission and core values, and a review of the proposed materials.
- Adoption Committee includes the purpose, composition (including SpEd, ELL, PRISM (change this to Gifted Program rep)duties
- Timeline – represents all of the activities that have already taken place and those currently planned.
- Archives has previous documents
- Pilot schedule and resources
- OSPI resources
- National Standards
- Information Nights – date, location, time
- FAQs - Steve focused on one question about why we looked the materials we did, showed a chart of standards alignment and how we are using the two reports.
- Your input – email to mathadoption@bsd405.org

Dallas asked a question about how we will reply to emails that come from the public. Likely we will add to the FAQs from the emails that come through. We will figure out how to deal with the email as it comes to us, depending on volume.

Do we have an obligation to follow OSPI recommendations? Linda answered by stating it is not a requirement that we use recommended materials, but that we need to have our students prepared for the assessments that come out of OSPI.

Sally asked about the end of course exams and when they will be implemented. Linda answered that this is a legislative mandate to pass two end of course assessments for students in the graduating class of 2013.

Sally asked if the Strategic report authors were part of the WA math standards. Sharon then summarized that there were two studies done of mathematical soundness that contradicted each other. Dallas requested that all documents be linked, including the two reports, and the March minutes of the State Board of Education. Always refer to the State Board of Education. What is OSPI? What is the responsibility of the legislature? Glossary.

Homework assignment for the committee is to review the materials on the website and provide input and advice for improving the materials available.

Decision Proposal

Sharon introduced the decision proposal. Dallas brought up the idea that the four parent votes might be buried in the voting out of the 26 members. Sarah Wallick wanted to make sure that parents be “on board” with the materials. There was continued discussion of the proportionality issue, high school teachers having greater numbers than middle school or parents. Parents will have opportunities to weigh in – how to influence the end vote is still a question. The proportion of parents and teachers on the committee was established last spring when the committee was established. The current plan is to share data on the website – help bring us to consensus. The question was raised regarding whether members of the committee are to represent some constituency or are they to vote their own mind?

Dallas stated that the core values were created by a committee that did not include parents. He stated that values are based on personal life history, not well understood by everyone. Maybe we should now review the values so that parents on the committee will understand the statements better. Linda shared that there is an annotated document that more clearly states what is meant by the statements. She will send this document sent out to all members.

Genevieve asked about the abstentions not allowed. It became clear that this committee is making a choice between Holt and Discovering for the series. Do we have to vote for a series or can we pick the Algebra 1 book from one series and the other books from the other series? Sharon made it clear that we must choose one program, we cannot use one book from one publisher and another from the other publisher.

Sharon asked for a vote on the decision-making model. One participant suggested that he felt he represented his school and that he needed to consult them before voting.

List of concerns:

- Should vote be required, or are abstentions allowed?
- Concern about the values – what do they mean, how does it apply to children?
- Vote according to my school, not the core values
- Report the votes of the various groups - avoid the experience of Issaquah, Seattle
- What if parents vote for A and all the teachers vote for B?
- Parents want an explanation of the values – want some input in the values
- Proposal revised to include subgroups – ms, hs, parents, specialists,

- Will email votes be allowed if absent?
- Missing meetings along the way – members need to be in attendance at some critical number of meetings

Table this until the next meeting.

Sharon announced that Phil Daro, participant in the National Core Standards in Mathematics, will be making a presentation to the committee on November 17, 4-6 pm, Room 122 at ESC. The November 19th meeting stands. This new meeting will not count against the requirement of attendance.

When voting, each member has one vote. Abstentions are not allowed. If a member is not able to be present, an email vote is allowed. We agree that at least a supermajority, 60%, of the whole group is a desired consensus. We also value the consideration of each of the groups, high school, middle school, parents, specialists/administrator, and curriculum department. We will be looking for a 60% consensus within each group as well as the whole.

For example Book A is favored by 17, B is favored by 9 of the 26 members of the committee. The subgroups vote is:

HS (includes Int'l) (9): 8 in favor of A, 3 in favor of B

MS (includes Robinswood) (6): 6 in favor of A, none in favor of B

Specialists/Administrator (4): 2 in favor of A, 1 in favor of B

Curriculum (3): 0 in favor of A, 3 in favor of B

Parents (4): 1 in favor of A, 3 in favor of B

Following the activity, Sharon presented the above example of the consensus model to the group. A fist of five vote indicated that there was general acceptance that this decision plan could be sent by email out to the whole committee for an email vote, using the fist to five.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm.