Middle School Math Textbook Adoption Committee

11/28/17 Minutes

Staff members present: Travis Sims, Lisa Kadobayashi, Sara Burke, Jasmine Riach, Julie Gatti, Wendy Miller, Hillary Graham, Jenna Velozo, Seth Bundy

Community members present: Helen Gerety, Fredrick Ngobi, Carol Cheyne

Adoption coordinators: Anna Box and Patrick Gray

1. Welcome and re-orientation to the work
   Review of agenda.
   Review of decision-making process highlighting consensus.
   Determined the order in which to receive/review/discuss feedback today.

2. Reviewed minutes from 6/13/17 meeting. One revision suggested – add names of members present at the meeting. Approved with revision.

3. Discussed revision to 5/30/17 minutes to note resignation of committee member. Minutes revised and approved. Updated version to be posted online.

4. There was discussion of a subset of the adoption committee joining with other leaders to form a textbook PD committee or advisory group. At the very least, the adoption committee asked that textbook PD occur in June, August, October, and throughout the first two years of implementation, the sign-up be available beginning no later than mid-March, and there be clear communication with principals and executive directors about the mandatory nature of textbook PD.

5. Student Feedback – committee reviewed narratives from student panel discussions to look for trends, similarities, and differences. Since the sample size was small, members asked that the comments be considered only as possible trends, similarities, and difference.

   a. There might be evidence that *enVision* was more often described as helpful for students when they were struggling.
   b. There might be evidence that *Glencoe* book contained more math problems. No evidence of this as a pro or a con, though.
   c. There might be some evidence that *enVision* problems make more abrupt jumps in difficulty.

   Overall, student feedback did not suggest a clear preference. The comments will be helpful however in implementing whichever book is selected.

6. Community Feedback – committee reviewed survey (online and paper) data from community members (parents, teachers, general public).

    a. Community feedback showed a clear preference for *enVision* in the first four out of five categories.

    b. Neither *enVision* nor *Glencoe* had a clear advantage or disadvantage in the fifth category (racial and gender bias).

7. Classroom Observation Data – staff members visited every pilot teacher classroom to gather quantitative data. Committee was presented with raw data and averages in multiple categories.

    a. Committee members noted that data reflects quick snapshots in time and that teacher expertise and experience might have impacted what would be observed.

    b. There may be an overall advantage for *enVision* in four out of six categories.

    c. Committee member noted that while *Glencoe* had a slightly higher score (0.04 points) in Mathematical Content, enVision had a substantially higher score (0.43 points higher) in the sub-category for differentiation. (Scores are on a 2-point scale.)

    d. Data seemed to indicate *enVision* does a slightly better job with special populations.

    e. Committee member asked for overall average score for each classroom sorted by percent of students who are non-white. That analysis was provided after lunch.

    f. Classrooms with higher percentages of students of color (> 80%) seemed to have overall higher classroom observation scores for *enVision* than for *Glencoe* and particularly higher scores in student engagement.

8. Pilot Teacher Committee Member Feedback – pilot teachers who are also on the adoption committee were asked to provide a brief summary of their experiences using *enVision* (3 teachers) or *Glencoe* (3 teachers). Each teacher spoke for approximately 2.5 minutes and answered clarifying questions from committee members. Each teacher was asked to give the curriculum they used a score on a 1-5 scale.

9. Committee members were asked to express preferences for the type of data to review in next week's meeting.

    a. Pre/Post-Test Data – Not essential to have a one-to-one match between students who took the Pre-Test and students who took the Post-Test.
        i. Providing a breakdown by School is top priority.
        ii. Providing a breakdown by Ethnicity is second priority.
        iii. Providing a breakdown by Grade in School is third priority.

    b. 8th Grade Smarter Balanced Assessment Interim
        i. Hope to compare *Glencoe* to *enVision* to current curriculum outcomes.
        ii. Unlikely to be able to disaggregate data.

    c. Pilot Teacher Survey Data – all pilot teachers have been asked to complete a survey about the curriculum they piloted.
        i. Strong preference for adoption coordinators to provide a general summary of trends.

10. Next Meeting: December 5, 2017, 8:00am at the John Stanford Center