



**Committee for Mathematics Achievement (CMA)
SUMMARY**

OCT 28, 2024

ATTENDANCE: Ashley Adams, Melissa Biggerstaff, Kelly Delong, Donna Froedge, Zac Gibbons, Funda Gonulates, Jeanie Jones, Stacy Justus, Amy Leasgang, Jamie-Marie Miller, Anthony Mires, Michael Phillips, Chrystal Rowland, Jason Taylor, Ed Thome, Kim Zeidler-Waters

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chris Barwell, Mason Dyer, Amanda Ellis, Jamie Link, Alvia Littleton, Natalie Rashad, Joanna Stevens,

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (KDE) REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT: Jennifer Fraley, Kris Jarboe

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m. ET.

SUMMARY:

Agenda Item: Welcome, Approval of October Agenda and July Summary Minutes

Presenter: Ashley Adams, Chair

Summary of Discussion:

Adams welcomed everyone to the meeting and Kris Jarboe provided links to the meeting agenda and July summary minutes in the chat. Adams asked for motions to approve.

Funda Gonulates made a motion to approve the minutes and Stacy Justus seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously by a roll call vote.

Anthony Mires made a motion to approve the agenda. Melissa Biggerstaff seconded the motion. The agenda was also approved unanimously by a roll call vote.

Feedback: No feedback was offered by the committee.

Agenda Item: Kentucky Department of Education Updates

Presenter: Jennifer Farley, Division Director

Summary of Discussion:

Fraley discussed updates around the KY Numeracy Counts Act. She shared that HB 162 establishes what all students should receive in terms of numeracy, through both teaching and learning, and supports student “number sense” beyond memorization, defining numeracy as the ability and confidence to understand, reason with, and apply mathematical concepts in

real-world situations. Fraley shared the critical areas of the KY Numeracy Counts Act, including math-specific universal screeners and diagnostics, teacher and administrator training and access to high-quality instructional resources (HQIR), along with an implementation timeline.

Feedback: No feedback was offered by the committee.

Agenda Item: Summary of Draft Process and Overview of Key Priorities With Committee Feedback

Presenter: Ashley Adams, Chair

Summary of Discussion:

Adams thanked the members of the subcommittee and complimented their work on the Kentucky Strategic Plan to Improve Student Achievement in Mathematics draft. She noted that multiple areas of mathematics expertise were represented on the subcommittee, making it a true P-20 collaboration. Adams explained that the process for designing the draft consisted of two in-person meetings. The first in-person meeting included a careful review of all prior full committee reflections and feedback. Using the feedback along with the components listed in KRS 158.842, six Key Priorities were identified as foundational for the revised Strategic Plan. The subcommittee then began working on goals and actions to support each Key Priority. After some asynchronous work, the subcommittee reconvened for a second meeting to refine the Key Priority narratives, goals and actions, and ensure that each was aligned to current evidence-based research. Adams then opened the floor for discussion and/or questions regarding the draft.

Feedback: Kelly Delong commented that there was a nice flow within the subcommittee, particularly by beginning with students in mind and ending with the importance of recruiting and retaining good mathematics teachers. She voiced confidence that the focus of the draft Strategic Plan is achievable. Chrystal Rowland added that the subcommittee did a nice job keeping shareholders in mind in terms of readability.

Kim Zeidler-Watters asked about clarity in language with the concern that some terms might have different meanings for different shareholder groups. Adams responded that a glossary of terms would be included in the final draft. Zeidler-Watters also commented that she appreciated the work of the subcommittee and saw the draft as a usable document.

Anthony Mires shared that he noticed that although growth mindset was mentioned specifically for students, it was only implied for other shareholders, and this might need to be addressed. Adams agreed. Mires added that the whole draft embodied a growth mindset but specifying that for all shareholder groups might be a consideration. Zeidler-Watters suggested that the time, effort and partnership aspects of growth mindset be considerations as the draft becomes finalized. Rowland acknowledged the concern and commented that the Strategic Plan should address the attitudes and beliefs of teachers about mathematics per KRS 158.842, so additional growth mindset language could potentially extend across multiple Key Priorities.

Adams suggested that committee members take some time to read over the draft again and consider other thoughts or questions. Jarboe responded that an exit survey regarding the draft would be provided at the conclusion of the meeting for additional comments or reflections that may arise after the discussion.

Agenda Item: Review and Discussion of Vision Statement

Presenter: Chrystal Rowland, Division Director

Summary of Discussion:

Rowland shared that the subcommittee began work on the Strategic Plan vision statement by reviewing vision statement criteria and using that as a call to action. Using the criteria as well as subcommittee feedback, the vision statement evolved into three sections, including a vision for student success, a description of how the Key Priorities support the vision and an explanation of how shareholders can support mathematical achievement. Rowland asked the committee to review the vision statement in terms of alignment to what is envisioned for students and opened the floor for discussion.

Feedback: Adams commented that she saw this as a good vision statement, encompassing all the feedback and discussions from the subcommittee. Zeidler-Watters added that it was a good vision statement and suggested that including language around seeing that mathematics is everywhere be a consideration. Gonulates agreed, stating that students having the disposition of owning mathematics and enjoying the process also be considered. Justus suggested language also be added that mentions how the development of an appreciation of mathematics can be used as a means to understand the world and interact with the environment. Biggerstaff added that the additional language would be a good connection to graduate profiles. Rowland acknowledged the considerations and connections and asked the committee if there was any additional feedback regarding the vision on how shareholders could engage in mathematics achievement. Adams asked if language specific to P-20 should be added to ensure those shareholder groups are represented. Jamie-Marie Miller added that she wondered if an explicit reference to exceptional learners should be included within shareholder engagement. Gonulates commented that teachers can be considered designers and coordinators as well as deliverers of instruction and asked if that distinction should be included within this section of the vision statement. Biggerstaff agreed and stated that she also considers teachers to be instructional designers, not just deliverers of a curriculum. Rowland acknowledged these comments and suggested that these and other considerations be detailed in the exit survey.

Zeidler-Watters asked the group to think about the role building level administrators have in supporting a vision for students and encouraged everyone to include their thoughts in the exit survey. She went on to say that a high-quality mathematics program needs strong leadership to be successful. Mires added that the term “cultivate” might be considered as a way to describe collaboration towards a common vision across multiple shareholders.

Follow-up Required: Feedback from the exit survey will be carefully collected, reviewed and incorporated into the draft as applicable.

Agenda Item: Adjournment

Presenter: Ashley Adams, Chair

Summary of Discussion:

Adams asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Jason Taylor. Miller seconded the motion, and the motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m. ET.

Feedback: No feedback was offered by the committee.