

Math Standards Writing Committee

Wednesday, May 11, 2016

8:55 AM

ATTENDANCE

Facilitator:

Melissa Fast, KSDE

Writing Committee:

Jerry Braun, Cheryl Delacruz, Danira Fernandez-Flores, Forest Knox, Kim Lackey, Sherri Martinie, Sheila Meegers, Maria Ortiz-Smith, Elizabeth Peyser, Marc Rhoades, John Scoggins, Lynette Sharlow, Brian Shelton, Sarah Stevens, Debbie Thompson, Rich Wilson

Ad Hoc Committee:

Paula Hough, Martin Kollman, Deb Matthews, Alicia Stoltenberg, Diana Stanfil,

The meeting began shortly after 9:00a. Melissa Fast introduced Debbie Thompson, the Writing Committee Chair. Debbie shared her background. Then, each member introduced themselves and shared why they want to be on the committee.

There are 3 separate subcommittees within the large group: Ad hoc; Writing; and Review. Melissa explained the roles of each subcommittee and the timeline of the work. Next, Melissa explained the groups, Elem., Middle, and High, and Ad hoc members are allowed to choose which group(s) they will want to join in for conversation. Each member is to understand that what is discussed during the two-day meeting, that it needs to be confidential. Nothing is to be shared until after the standards are approved next year. The groups should not feel rushed during this process. Quality is very key! Also, Melissa pointed out that having various representation on the committees was vital. Melissa will be the scribe during the meeting.

Debbie gave an overview of what the final standards should be for the teachers. Debbie shared that Steve Roberts is writing separate math standards, and the group will watch a video he created. Mr. Roberts' standards are in the Google drive folder. Please keep in mind that this is only a submission, and we have allotted 30 minutes on the agenda for this, and we will adjust the time as needed based on the discussion and feedback. Jeannette further explained why Mr. Roberts approached the group with his standards. He wasn't able to be at the meeting, so he provided the video (www.realmathstandards.com).

The video began at 9:45a.

Next, the group separated to discuss what feedback to provide. Then, the group gave general feedback for Roberts.

- A lot of items were focused on doing things rather than the meaning as well
- No real world context
- No high school standards
- All verbs are lower level Blooms
- Left wondering what research was used to determine decisions
- Small ideas spread out in a random order
- No mention of bigger picture ideas
- Grain size is very small

- Frustration around moving students up but then there are tests used to allow entrance into the next level of mathematics
- Tiered instruction allows for acceleration and remediation to take place naturally
- Nothing at the conceptual level
- Really offended by the bad parenting comment with Pre-K
- Like the concept of seamless chunking of standards but schools would need more tiered teachers to meet these needs
- Like the idea of grouping to do testing where we test first half of current grade level and second half of previous grade level
- Like idea of moving negative numbers down
- Liked focus on unit fractions
- Liked grouping items in 2nd grade
- A lot of similarities around number sense in current standards
- Like the statement that not every child learns the same
- Shame given to child if they do not pass the mandatory exams
- Understand place value is great in the early grades
- Use of number line is a great attribute
- Seemed very concerned with the ability to move ahead and not move ahead
- Bigger system concerns seem to be more of the focus in the video
- Lack of connecting standards to previous or future standards
- The 8th grade standards are allowing for acceleration to high math standards
- Are we determining in 8th grade who is college bound?
- Need high school guidance

Debbie moved the group on the next step in the process, Front Matter, which includes the standards format.

After a 10 minute break, Debbie showed the ELA standards format to the group. Melissa wanted to start the discussion with having consistent language, such as Standards, Clusters and Domains. Also, the point of having the flip books added as appendices to the math standards was discussed, especially including

links rather than documents would allow less clutter. The decision was to use Standards, Clusters, and Domains as standards vocabulary.

Jeannette addressed how the SECD standards and Rose Capacity will link with the math standards. The question on whether character development would be eliminated is how would that affect the math standards. The decision on where SECD standards and Rose Capacity is placed into the math standards is determined by the Math writing subgroups. A member posed the question: The current vision is political, so why is it being incorporated into the academic standards? Jeannette explained the crosswalk documents on how standards are connected to the Rose Capacity, which is mandated by legislation. Also, Jeannette mentioned that with ELA standards, there were obvious alignments. A member mentioned that the math standards should stay as far away for the politics as possible. A political determination is why the state standards have to align with Rose Capacity. A vote was taken on whether to embed the SECD standards and Rose Capacity into the Math standards was conducted or put them in the Front Matter. Sixteen members (sans Ad hoc) voted in favor that SECD standards and Rose Capacity are placed in the Front Matter.

Melissa suggested adding an explanation the tags. Debbie illustrated a few examples of how to identify the domains/clusters/standards: 2.NBT.1a; 2.NBT.A.1a.

Thursday, May 12, 2016
8:55 AM

Group continued to work in teams on the various grade bands of the standards. At the end of the day it was decided that more time was needed to complete draft one of the standards. Melissa Fast plans to send out a survey to establish when the three-day event will take place.