

Outreach and Advocacy committee report
1/4/13

On January 3, 2013, Gretchen Muller attended the Public Hearing on the proposed revisions to the CA CCSSM. Tom Adams conducted the meeting. Patricia Rucker represented the SBE and two other CDE representatives were also present. Those speaking were Ze'ev Wurman, Mark Freethy (both members of the original Academic Standards Commission), Kathleen Bradley (SFUSD), Gretchen Muller (OUSD/CMC), Marianne Kearny Brown (Benicia), Barbara Aragon (Vallejo), and Steve Bacachi (Elk Grove). April Cherrington (SMCOE) was also in attendance but did not speak. All but Ze'ev were in favor of the revisions. Mark and Steve expressed some reservations regarding the elimination of all of the 8th grade algebra course standards. A few of the speakers addressed issues that were more suited for the framework development and implementation process.

The comments were concluded in about 30 minutes and during the remaining time, informal conversations occurred. Gretchen asked Tom Adams a question regarding AB 1246 and how local adoptions would play into to the Williams Act. Tom said that CDE staff with their legal council is working on an FAQ that will be posted soon. In short, he said that any books that meet the 1997 adoption or are aligned to the new CCSSM would qualify.

The next work for the committee is the release of the draft of the Framework in March and coordinating feedback opportunities for our members.

Diane DeMille represented CMC at the Supplemental Instructional Materials Review in September. Her notes are below.

**Training of Reviewers
September 27-28, 2012
Observation for CMC by Dr. Dianne DeMille**

Day 1 – 10:00 – Meeting began with an overview for everyone

Began with an overview of the four step process

Four-Step process by program and by grade level

Step 1

- Record the tally for each of the criteria for review
- Record the tally for each CCSS standard being reviewed
- Deliberation and bring to consensus for each criteria
 - After tallies, will approach the ones with more “no’s”
 - Need to discuss those with 4 or more and reach consensus

Step 2

- Public comment: 15 minutes, twice a day

Step 3

- Write Report of Findings
- Reviewed by CDE
- Final Report of Findings signed off

Step 4

- Recommendations – included with Report of Findings

The standards for mathematical practices was done by CDE staff with existing texts. Therefore they are not part of the review process if it was covered in the existing materials.

My review during Day 1 and beginning of Day 2 with Group 5 reviewing **Grades 6-7** materials

Grades 6-7 with CINCH, Prentice Hall, McDougall, & Holt

CINCH – an online program – all criteria met (with 1 abstention because did not have time to review all material)

- There were several concerns brought up that were resolved during public comment. On major thing was that the reviewers were not sent the textbooks that were referenced in many sections of the online materials. The materials were brought in for reviewers to check and satisfied most questions brought up. This took quite a bit of time to resolve the many concerns reviewers had when they began the meeting.
- Another concern was brought up when Geometry Sketchpad was asked to be used to see some of the geometry lessons. When the program was submitted for review, they were in the process of acquiring Key Curriculum Press. Now that they have the Sketchpad as part of their own materials, they will be sent with the materials for all programs connected to it for use in the classroom.
- Abstention concern: Not clear how the online materials are integrated with the text

Publisher comments -

- Shared some navigation for the program, including the powerful search engine
- Clarified those areas not found
- Brought in full textbooks to reference for fuller understanding

Prentice Hall Materials – all criteria met

- There were some details reviewers had difficulty finding. These were found with reviewers conversations
- There was confusion about whether parentheses were added in standards as “for example” or must use “all” within the () as in Standard 7Geo 2.4

Publisher comments -

- Expanded – some things needed that were not seen
- Technology – to use for construction. There are built in math tools available within the program

Harcourt Materials – all criteria met

- There were some details reviewers had difficulty finding. These were found with reviewers conversations
- There was confusion about whether parentheses were added in standards as “for example” or must use “all” within the () as in Standard 7Geo 2.4

Publisher comments -

- Expanded – some things needed that were not seen

- Technology – to use for construction. There are built in math tools available within the program

Holt Materials – all criteria met

- There were some details reviewers had difficulty finding. These were found with reviewers conversations
- Some questions about questions referring to weight or volume when asking questions about “low-bearing fruit”

Publisher comments -

- Expanded – some things needed that were not seen

McDougal Materials – all criteria met

- There were some details reviewers had difficulty finding. These were found with reviewers conversations

Publisher comments -

- Expanded – some things needed that were not seen

Day 2 after 10:00

Moved to three other rooms

McGraw Hill – *Everyday Math* (was finished early with full criteria met for all grade levels)

- Ready to sign off at 10:45 with no edits or corrections and no citations for social content

Publisher comments -

- A thank you for the process
- Learning a lot from the discussions

Pearson Scott Foresman, *enVision Math* (was met for all grade levels except Grade 6)

- CCSS Standards were not all covered as required
- See report online at CDE.ca.gov for details

TPS – an online program – no one was there from publisher for comment or clarification

- Some questions related to social content (ie. 1 problem with a boy shooting a gun)
 - After reviewing the guidelines for social content – it does not fall into the description
- Imprecision on questions in the PPTs for every grade level
- There were many example problems with multiple answer choices
- There were 4 standards not met – this will be identified in the Final Report of Findings
- Need 2 sentence for why the criteria is not acceptable (1/K, 1/2nd, & 2/3rd)
- There are 4 standards not met

McGraw Hill – *California Mathematics* – all criteria met