

**Modesto City Schools  
COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES**

<b>COMMITTEE NAME: Math Study Committee</b>	<b>MEETING DATE: Tuesday, November 19, 2019</b>
Prepared by:  ○ Mike Rich Senior Director, CIPD	Phone Number (for questions on notes):  ○ 492-1132

**COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA:**

Welcome	Dr. Noguchi welcomed the team and thanked them for their hard work. Discussed the need to support all stakeholders by developing a math program.
Meeting Goals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Based on the data review and analysis we will make key findings and recommendations</li> <li>2. Reach consensus on a curriculum course of sequence for presentation to the Board in December, Integrated or Algebra/Geometry/Algebra II</li> <li>3. Begin textbook review</li> </ol>
Data Review and Analysis	<p>Internal survey results were reviewed; given to all MCS 9-12 math teachers (as well as 8th grade who teach SM I). Approximately 57 total responses were recorded. No results were received from requested outside school districts for comparison. Some questions had open ended qualitative responses. These results were also provided to the committee members. Not all comments were included, but incident counts for these comments were recorded, and a representative comments for the main topic were included. (See attached data)</p> <p>Data was reviewed in small groups and discussed in relation to the goals of the committee.</p> <p>Group share out key findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Curriculum lacks support for student and parent support</li> <li>○ Students are lacking necessary skills</li> <li>○ Curriculum serving the higher achieving students</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Group 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Disparity between the comments and the data around the collaboration and the PLC comments</li> <li>○ Curriculum has no additional resources</li> <li>○ Curriculum is not effective</li> <li>○ Not all comments support the quantitative data</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Group 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Intervention for struggling learners is not working. Need to have an option during the school day.</li> <li>○ Curriculum does not have the support, modifications, and structures to meet our needs.</li> <li>○ Instructional practices were not addressed in the survey but is a key part of developing a math program.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<p>Curious:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why do the teachers lack confidence in the material</li> <li>• Is there a lack of confidence in the curriculum or what the students need?</li> <li>• Did respondents get confused between “curriculum supplied supplementals” or teacher generated supplementals.</li> </ul>	
	<p>Site Visit Data Review</p>	<p>The process from the survey data was repeated for the site visit data. Data from the Tokay and McNair visits were shared in person from those attending the visits.</p> <p>Group share out key findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Commitment to PLC process with years in development (teacher-led, use of CFA, alignment to CAASPP, and use of interim assessments)</li> <li>○ Curriculum is not the most important</li> <li>○ CAASPP released tests as a pre/post test</li> <li>○ Some schools did not have a below grade 9 option</li> <li>○ Options for other math courses (stats, etc.)</li> <li>○ Sanger had curriculum specialists to help struggling students</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Group 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Effective PLC process</li> <li>○ Intervention during the day is vital</li> <li>○ Curriculum was the least important, but it needs to be published with available resources</li> <li>○ Integrated vs traditional wa a non-issue</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Group 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The curriculum did not matter</li> <li>○ Strong-well run, well established PLC was the key</li> <li>○ Teacher driven PD</li> <li>○ 50% of the sites had a non-CP option at targeted levels</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	<p>Key Findings Draft</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important items that need to be addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Placement</li> <li>• Promotion</li> <li>• Assessments</li> <li>• Professional Development related to instructional strategies</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MCS must provide a curriculum that supports EL’s, low and high academic achievers, and students with disabilities. The curriculum must be accessible to parents and foster parent engagement. Additionally, it must provide supplemental materials and support differentiation.</li> <li>2. Interventions are most effective when provided to students during the school day.</li> <li>3. PLCs are an integral part of a successful math program. They are most effective when they are formal, provide meaningful cross-curricular collaboration, and are teacher-driven.</li> </ol>	

Group discussion  
about Course of  
Study

- Group 1:
  - Some members felt their vote from five years ago was not validated
  - Consensus was to move to AGA
  - Standards alignment seems more familiar to teachers
  - If move to AGA, then there needs to be a different lens that before to not fall into the same issues
    - Maybe: High achievers concurrent enrollment in Alg/Geo or Geo/Alg II
    - Maybe: Placement for low achievers to allow for support
    - Maybe: Math classes focused on specific content (robotics, nursing, CTE, etc.)
  - Regardless of AGA or Integrated, we need career-ready options
  - Most teachers prefer the AGA
  - Course sequence order might need to be reviewed
  - Like the way that AGA builds on itself during the course of the year
- Group 2:
  - Since the vote from five years ago, some teachers have felt their vote may be different
  - Essential standards are key to gaining consistency from classroom to classroom
  - What supports will be in place for students that move into the district from an AGA or Integrated course of sequence?
- Group 3:
  - Vote five years ago were to switch to Integrated
  - Group does not feel personally it does not matter either way
  - Standards are different now from before
  - Consensus was to stay integrated math
  - Difficult for SpED teachers to make goals aligned to Integrated for IEPs
  - Regardless of curriculum, we need to identify essential standards so that the focus is on what students need to know to be successful and proficient at the end of the course, and we need to communicate these with all stakeholders (similar to what was seen at the Whittier visit)

Proposal:

- The group has the opportunity to look at Integrated and AGA options with the goal of deciding which course of sequence we will recommend.
- We will hold a meeting prior to the December 9th Board meeting to come to a consensus.
- Curricula will be available for a span of time for Committee members to review.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**


<b>Committee Member Name</b>	<b>Site/Role or Non-MCS</b>
Amy Chavkin	Modesto High Math Teacher
Anne Whiteside	Johansen Math Teacher
Cameron Guinn	Enochs Resource Teacher
Elias Pew	Downey Math Teacher
Heidi Pagani	Beyer Math Teacher
Jason Skeen	Davis Special Ed Teacher
Karolin Dodds	Enochs Math Teacher
Krystal Hill	Davis Math Teacher
Lori Gaines	Gregori Math Teacher
Mike Cantwell	Gregori Chemistry Teacher
Sally Hammond	Enochs Math Teacher
Steve McEwen	Modesto High Math Teacher
Veronica Davalos	MCS Math Coach
Karolin Babou-Dodds	Enochs Math Teacher
Marla Rucobo	MCS Math Coach
Jon Olson	Sylvan Math Teacher
Laura Granger	Sylvan Assistant Superintendent
Kim West	Stanislaus Union Assistant Superintendent
Christina Rubalcava	SCOE Math Project Coordinator
Don Davis	Waterford Superintendent

**NEXT STEPS/ACTION ITEMS:**

- Review curriculum prior to December 5<sup>th</sup>
- Vote on December 5<sup>th</sup> for vote of course sequence
- Meet on December 11<sup>th</sup> to establish pilot logistics

**NEXT MEETING DATE: December 5, 2019**

**Approved by:**

INSERT NAME OF COMMITTEE LEAD/APPROVER:  Date: 11/20/19