

NOTES for April 27, 2017, 8:00 - 3:00
Elementary Math Adoption Pilot Committee



Objectives:

- Debrief Round 3
- Discuss Final Recommendation



Agenda Item/Notes
<p>Goals for the Day</p> <p>1. Debrief Round 3 by making clear statements that all committee members suspend judgement for today's meeting and to speak objectively based on evidence.</p> <p>2. At the end, we will land on a choice curriculum and make a recommendation to the Board</p>
<p>Debrief in Program Groups (Investigations) Gather in same piloting groups Questions to consider----</p> <p>Think about the concept being taught and consider the following in your debrief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How was the concept developed?• What mathematical models and strategies were used to make that concept accessible to students?• Were the problem solving experiences rigorous for your students?• What were the structure(s) in the program that support all students?• Did you have to supplement with other materials?• Did you find the materials easy to use? What could have made the experience easier?• If you had to teach it again what would you change about the unit?• How did the instructional materials support differentiation for your age of learners?• What routines and practices are used to promote fluency?• Do you see any models that were developed K-5? Did the concepts build upon each other as the grades progressed? <p>Notes were taken on chart paper to be transcribed. See Curricula debrief notes.</p>
<p>Debrief by Grade level and Gallery Walk Assign TOSAs and Magdalena as note takers</p> <p>Teachers meet in grade level and share their findings about the programs. After sharing the plusses and deltas teachers will do a gallery walk. Teachers are to suspend judgement about the program.</p> <p>Notes were taken on chart paper to be transcribed. See Grade Level debrief notes.</p>
<p>“One Last Look” Review All Debrief Notes (from Rounds 1 and 2)</p>

Discussions at Grade level tables about the debrief notes from Round 1 and 2
Whole Group Share-out of big ideas that stand out:

Eureka: (highlights, things that stood out)

The lessons were not fun to teach

Lack of games

Teacher materials were difficult to navigate

Very teacher-centric

Lack of realia and manipulatives, visuals for EL's

Differentiation was not suggested in the lesson

Good math models, but a lot of I do, you do

Lesson easy to follow, students successful

Lessons were consistent, students knew what to expect

Sig. lack of online resources, games

There is a Mandarin version

Did not lend well to a math workshop model

Bridges:

Poor translation - difficult to find spanish components online

Grade 1 - excellent concept dev

Grade 3 - all students felt successful, very rich, can be very overwhelming

Grade 4 / 5 - Felt successful with fractions

EL - math talks

Connected the conceptual math to the standard alg

Workbooks user friendly

Balanced btw hands on and paper-pencil

Good balance of individual, partner, whole group

Games were good

Good rigor and built in differentiation and more student choice

Kinder - management was challenging even with extra adults in the room

4th - number corner and bridges - difficult to find time

4th - Fractions concept - objective and outcomes of lesson not clear

3rd - students had to defend their thinking and say why

4th - frustrated with the structure of the program and how the concepts flow (scope and sequence)

Examine Toolkit Evaluation Data (From all 3 Rounds)

Clarisse shares the final feedback from the Survey Evaluations

To begin shared the bar graphs with the overall rating for all 3

To focus the discussion, we will break into small groups and then share out:

Focus and Coherence - Even though it seemed that Inv. had a lower score, if you include the good category with the very good and excellent, Inv had higher total percentage.

Rigor and Math Practices group 1 - We looked at the critical thinking question: Bridges had more green, then Eureka, then Inv.

Next question - Bridges had most green, then Eureka, then Inv.

Next question - Bridges had most green, then Inv, then Eureka

Rigor and Math Practices group 2 - Looking at practice standards - consistently, Bridges did the best, then looked at the red - Inv. and Eureka had more red

Usability and Universal Access group 1 - We looked at the overall green and it was Bridges, Inv, then Eureka, looking at the red, Eureka had the most red and Inv. had the least red

Usability and Universal Access group 2 - The alternative programs are not well represented in this data, the lower grades have different perspective/results than upper grades. It is important to weigh what works best, Bridges seems to be the most adaptable to multi-age classrooms

Reminder: We teach the standards and the curriculum is meant to support the teaching of the standards. In the end, it is not adherence to the curriculum, but the teaching and understanding of the standards

3 Essential Questions - (review and survey)

For each curricula

Clarisse gives directions for teachers to take the final survey

Lunch

Data Department Presentation & Q/A

Clarisse Shares with the group the survey results for the 3 essential questions:

Q 1: Bridges 91%/74%, Eureka 57%/26%, Inv. 72%/34%

Q 2: Bridges 71%/64%, Eureka 52%/7, Inv. 83%/43%

Q 3: Bridges 83%/64%, Eureka 50%/17%, Inv. 84%/41%

First percentage includes Excellent, Very good, good

Second percentage includes Excellent and Very

Overview of Voting Process

Voting Groups

Present voting structure (4 points, random groups)

Each voting group will have 4 total points to allocate to the three piloted curricula, using the following rules:

- All four points must be used.
- Only integer points may be used.
- 3 points indicates "Strongly recommend."
- 2 points indicates "Recommend, with minor reservations."
- 1 point indicates "Recommend, with moderate reservations."
- 0 points indicates "Do not recommend."
- Note: There is no 4-point option.

Voting Discussion

Circle back to the 3 essential questions

Group Vote

The 8 groups met and discussed their positions to make group votes.

Final Recommendation and Discussion

Bridges: 22

Eureka: 2

Investigations: 8

Core Curriculum Recommendation based on the group vote:

Bridges in Mathematics

Supplemental Curriculum Recommendation: Eureka/Engage NY

Comments:

Bridges is not the best choice for Spanish Immersion, they prefer Eureka because it has the best translation, if Eureka is not adopted then the professional development that goes with it would also not be there to support.

Bridges is an ok choice for Mandarin Immersion

Eureka is a free and can be used to supplement anyway

Professional development is necessary for the Bridges program.

Are teachers expected to teach only the Bridges Curriculum with Fidelity?

No, teachers are expected to teach the standards based on their students' needs.

Teachers are partners with the curriculum and it is a tool to use for instruction in teaching and learning.

Teachers are flexible and are willing to work with the district and expect a gradual roll out with gradual expectation the evolve over a 2-3 year process.

Thank You

Next Steps: BoE Meeting dates, Returning Materials

May 4th pick-up - all pilot materials to be returned including manipulatives

BoE presentation on May 9th, 2017