BOARD OF EDUCATION
COMMUNITY CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT 64

Minutes of the Committee-of-the-Whole: Recommendations from
Math Curriculum Review Committee on Curriculum Materials
held at 7:00 p.m. on March 18, 2013
Lincoln Middle School – Gym
200 S. Lincoln Ave., Park Ridge, IL

President John Heyde called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. Other Board members present were Dan Collins, Pat Fioretto, Scott Zimmerman, and Anthony Borrelli. Board member Eric Uhlig was absent; Board member Sharon Lawson arrived at 7:09 p.m. Also present were Superintendent Philip Bender, Assistant Superintendents Joel T. Martin and Lori Hinton, Director of Technology Terri Bresnahan, Director of Special Education/Pupil Services Jim Even, Director of Facility Management Scott Mackall, Business Manager Becky Allard, Public Information Coordinator Bernadette Tramm, and 15 members of the public.

President Heyde stated the purpose of the meeting was to hear the recommendations from the Math Curriculum Review Committee on curriculum materials to be adopted. Dr. Bender provided an overview of the work of the committee in relation to the District's Strategic Plan and District-wide priorities. He noted that the report of the Math Committee would be followed at the next meeting by a report from the Board Advanced Technology Committee, whose work also emanates from the Strategic Plan and District priorities.

Dr. Hinton introduced other committee representatives presenting with her: Tracie Thomas, K-5 Math Curriculum Specialist; Christie Thielen, middle school Math Department Chair; Matt Bozeday, Washington grade 4 teacher; Josh Hammond, Lincoln grade 6 math teacher; and Mark Pancini, Lincoln grade 7/8 math teacher.

Dr. Hinton confirmed that materials for math have not been selected since 2003 for the middle school level and 2004 for the elementary grades. She stated that the committee would provide an overview of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM); describe the rigorous process the committee used to select materials; focus on specific recommendations, including the reasons why these materials will have the most significant impact on student learning; and provide a cost analysis of the recommended materials.

Mr. Hammond and Ms. Thomas reviewed the committee's broad membership and its goals. Dr. Hinton offered examples of the challenging problem-solving that is representative of the new CCSSM, and then described two important pieces of the CC that have significant implications for instruction: the content standards that outline content learning expectations at each grade level by identifying the topics that are to be addressed and the depth in which they will be explored; and, the eight standards for mathematical practice that describe various expertise that all math teachers should seek to develop in their students.
She noted that the implementation of the CCSSM would cause three instructional shifts in math: focus – the CCSS focus on fewer topics at each grade level and address them in greater depth; coherence – instruction will encourage students to think across grades and link to major topics within grades, which ultimately will lead to a deeper understanding

of topics; and rigor – students will be required to demonstrate all three aspects of math knowledge, including deep conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, and application of this knowledge to solve real-world problems.

Ms. Thomas offered an overview of the committee's work during the year to learn about the CCSSM, the mathematical practices, and new assessments from the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), which will replace the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) in 2014-15. She also described the professional development provided to District 64 staff this year in conjunction with the new Math Professional Development Team. Ms. Thomas then introduced the three curriculum alignment analysis tools the committee used to evaluate the curricular materials that could support District 64 teachers with the implementation of the standards. The tools were developed by a national team of educators and mathematicians, and provide objective measures to help local educators evaluate the content alignment, alignment to mathematical practices and other essential features of different curricular materials.

Mr. Bozeday reported how the committee had used the first two tools to assess District 64's current math series, which pointed out significant gaps in the alignment of the content standards and mathematical practices. Ms. Thomas provided an example of how content had been added or moved from grade 5. She then described how the committee had invited publishers to present to the elementary committee members and the middle school members, and then utilized the first two tools to evaluate the materials and hone in on programs that most closely addressed fully the CCSSM and/or the Standards for Mathematical Practice. Ms. Thielen noted that the committee used the third tool to evaluate the remaining programs and met with the publishers to fully explore the technology and assessment components and answer questions. Ms. Thomas reported that the committee had also gathered additional information through lesson and unit sampling, and that middle school committee members conducted site visits to observe implementation of each of the programs.

Dr. Hinton shared the committee's recommendation to adopt the My Math series at grades K-5 and the Glencoe Math series at grades 6-8 for course 1, course 2, course 3, accelerated pre-Algebra, Algebra I and Algebra II, which are all published by McGraw-Hill. She reviewed six areas of strength identified by the committee that will positively impact student learning, including: CCSSM aligned; mathematical practices; Response to Intervention (RtI) components; 21st century technology; innovative assessment tools; and consumable guides. The other presenters offered further details about each area.

Speaking about the consumable guides, Dr. Hinton noted these are provided in lieu of a traditional textbook, are published each year, and are used in concert with "eEdition" online resources to provide students with comprehensive support for mastering their learning targets. She noted the online resources include virtual manipulatives, video tutorials, virtual tutors, an auditory glossary, online quizzes for self-monitoring, games to reinforce learning, and inquiry labs.

Turning to pricing, Dr. Hinton said the publisher offers multi-year packages that bundle the inexpensive consumable guides or print editions of the student text with the eEdition online resource, which will enable District 64 to access current pricing for multiple years depending on the grade level and package. Dr. Hinton summarized the recommendations based on the committee's cost analysis for each type of material, as detailed in her written report. Dr. Hinton reported that the total cost for the grades K-8

program is $404,821.83 plus an estimated 5 percent for shipping, bringing the total to $425,106.11. She noted that the publisher would provide free materials valued at $313,515.17, including all teacher materials grades K-8, all of the elementary grade level real world problem-solving libraries, and a portion of the manipulative kit costs. The total value to the District of the program, therefore, would be $718, 337.

Dr. Hinton then offered historical comparisons to the previous math materials adoption, including the initial cost and annual expenses. She also noted the Board had approved approximately $281,000 in 2009 for the adoption of the English Language Arts curriculum materials.

Turning to the committee's other two recommendations, Dr. Hinton reaffirmed that ongoing professional development would be essential to the implementation of the CCSSM, and that a comprehensive professional development plan would be designed to support the implementation of the new resources as well as the instructional shifts required to successfully implement the core standards. She also pointed out that teachers representing grade-level teams will convene this summer to design rich performance tasks for students drawn from a number of resources, which are representative of the deep thinking and rigor expected from our students.

Dr. Hinton stated that the committee's third recommendation was to finalize the District's Priority Standards identified by the work of the Strategy IV Student Learning Strategic Planning committees in previous years. She noted that the Math Committee would use an audit completed in conjunction with the committee's consultant to identify and make small adjustments as needed.

In summary, Dr. Hinton reviewed how the current recommendations are aligned to the District 64 Strategic Plan, pointing out that the District's current area of focus is the implementation of CCSS with technology integration. She stated that the recommendation for this materials adoption supports this strategic focus, because: the materials are aligned to the content standards and practice; the program requires the essential skills of the 21st century learning framework and is compatible with the District's technology vision to support student learning and our specific tools; and that ongoing professional development will support teachers in making the three instructional shifts in this transition. She concluded by noting the committee structure itself, primarily made up of teachers, affirmed the District's commitment to collaboration and shared decision-making.

Given the hour, Board President Heyde proposed and Board members were in consensus to defer discussion of the math curriculum recommendations to the regular meeting and also to move action on student fees for 2013-14 to the start of that agenda.

President Heyde concluded the Committee-of-the-Whole meeting at 7:39 p.m., which was followed immediately by the regular Board meeting.

_____
President

_____
Secretary