

OKLAHOMA ACADEMIC STANDARDS MATHEMATICS FOURTH DRAFT

1. Clevetta Gray – Muskogee. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.
Introduction – “This is a great document it is easy to read. Your addition of ideas of how to teach will be very valuable for new teachers or those at 0-5 level that are uncomfortable with math.”
“The glossary addition is a great idea. Many parents will need this for vocabulary.”
2. Sherri McMillan – Bixby. *Guiding questions concerns on Rigor & Progression*
“In 3rd, 4th, 5th grade mathematics, I feel like we have taken a step back in the area of multiplication & division. 4th should be doing 2 digit division & 1 digit division in 3rd grade. The concept of division and the fact family should be taught.” (*NOTE: These comments were written before she was able to find the 3th & 4th grade standards. She changed her mind after speaking with & working directly with the Director of Elementary Mathematics.*)
3. Randy Rader – Enid. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.
4. June Gerred – Glenpool. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.
5. Bill Vann – Chickasaw Nation. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.
“They (the standards - appear to meet all the criteria) it’s difficult to determine how effective they are until the standards have been in effect for a while. Fairly easy to follow and progress in a logical manner. Lots of standards for grades 3-7!”
6. Carmen Walters – Guthrie. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.
“Need an easier to read vertical alignment charts list only. In the glossary: list grade levels ‘CK’ introduced, then what grade covered again. “(*NOTE: Readers copy did not have the vertical alignment section*)
7. Joe Griese – Chickasaw Nation. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.
“Great in depth objectives! Very clear but lots of standards to cover. Some standards could maybe consolidate with each other. The math standards are very impressive and thought-through. Rubric - category for rigor maybe should be written differently for elementary evaluators” (...*credit-bearing college courses... ..entry-level, quality high-growth jobs?- see rubric*)
8. Tawn Rundle – Merritt. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.

OKLAHOMA ACADEMIC STANDARDS MATHEMATICS

FOURTH DRAFT

“Elementary Geom. ..2.4 in 1,2,3,4, is not consistent in unit of measurement/metric. Appreciate the ease of understanding and the consistent terminology. 5th will have a sig. (*significant*) change - but doable with teacher training.”

9. Ben White – Chickasaw Natation. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.
10. Shannon Thompson – Moore. Guiding questions were met positively on rubric.

“Better connections between standards than PASS. Allows for deeper teaching . Communicate changes 1st – small bites by grade level. Have videos on-line available for teachers to access at will that are short and specific to the point of “how will this change my classroom?” Keep in mind that PD budgets have been cut- we will have to be very creative in how we train teachers.”
11. Cindy Schimdt & Mickey Edwards – Chickasha. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.

“Standards lend themselves to a variety of assessments. Aligned by grade level and progression – appreciate both! The vertical alignment will be very helpful to teachers. The new standards will allow teachers to go into greater depth to ensure conceptual understanding. We appreciate the process being folded into the standards. We are really excited about an implementation guide to come. Thanks for the work. Great job. Any assistance with transitioning to the new standards will be appreciated. We would be glad to help in anyway and could host regional training.”
12. Lance Crawley – Broken Arrow. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.
13. Kathy Dunn – Mid-Del. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.

“We must maintain rigor throughout the grades while teaching with age-appropriate strategies. The objectives are descriptive enough to drive good instructional practice. The 1st (horizontal & vertical alignment) I have seen in standards that redundancy is eliminated or at least lessened! It seems a bit more than Marzano’s research would support as manageable for year of effective instruction BUT it is better written to “pass along” the standards rather than the repetition and redundancy of the past.

 - a. A. We need a Parent Grade Level Guide/Parent Newsletters prepared, ready-to-roll, that explain how a standard is “developmentally appropriate” based on how it is taught in the primary grades particularly.
 - b. Glossary is awesome
 - c. Newsflash: I love Math!! (The way it is presented here.) By reading this Standards document – I believe that I could teach math in a developmentally

OKLAHOMA ACADEMIC STANDARDS MATHEMATICS

FOURTH DRAFT

appropriate way without a background or experience in teaching math. The objectives are so well written.”

14. Melani Mouse – Putnam City. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric
“The addition of the Glossary is helpful. Function in Algebra & Algebra II – I like that both ELA & Math will look similar. Sub-standards provide more clarity for measurement. Assess at the standard level not objective level. Much better than what we had before! ☺. Math did a great job here and * am glad ELA is doing the same. Vertical progression is in the process of being developed. Yea! It would be nice to move to Math I, II, & III, but the bundling of the standards is a good step in the process. No hidden standards – so the 1st year teacher will be prepared. Focus at each grade level to simplify for all what is most important.”

15. Lynn Barnes – OKC. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric
“Levels raised across grade levels. Concise, yet explicit. Clearly shows what student is expected to know or be able to do. Great progression – including addition of fraction and monetary conceptual understanding in early grades. Note: huge jump in actual number of standards between 5th & 6th grades. 6th grade does seem to be a bit overloaded but it works! Love that mathematical language is used throughout & glossary is included.”

16. Amy Fichtner – Owasso. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric
“Terms are consistent – so helpful!! Standards use childhood curiosity /age appropriate objectives for early childhood/elementary education. The skills are logically organized and provide real world learning throughout the scope and sequence. Skills related to money, factoring decimals, etc. provide functional math. College prep skills are well articulated to provide for learners. Clear language is exceptional! Terms can be utilized more effectively than in any previous version. Familiarity will make these standards more manageable in days ahead. The standards, by grade level contained, provide opportunities to use time more wisely.
 - a. Example: If 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade math have the same standards in their curriculum that could unintentionally lead to duplicity or omission by defining the responsibility for each grade, without overlap instructional days are used to maximize instructional time.”

17. Bianca Rose – OPSRC. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric
Rigor- “Yes as long they are taught in sequence. I am concerned about the ambiguity in the actions & processes specifically ability to communicate mathematically. The majority of the standards offer a measurable way. Except for those worded as “know” number names or “understand”. PK. 1 and 3.GM.2. not sure how those can be verified or

OKLAHOMA ACADEMIC STANDARDS MATHEMATICS FOURTH DRAFT

observable. It is evident that great attention was given to make sure there is a logical progression between grades.

The number of standards seems manageable as long as students are progressing through the standards. The action & processes involving communicating mathematically do not seem very clear in the standards. Teachers will overlook these if it is not specified with measurable outcomes. This is one of the employability skills that has been left out from every version of our standards and it directly impacts how math standards can be “bundled” with ELA and other standards for the students benefit.”

18. Mara Goddard – Glenpool. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.
“The format is extremely user friendly. Including the MAPS at the top of each page is huge. Love that volume is starting in Kindergarten with developing the idea of capacity. The vertical alignment will be beneficial for teachers to see the connections among grade levels. Developing conceptual understanding with fractions is beneficial. I am happy to see it in the early grades.
 - a. Fluency – the definition is sufficient w/o the time constraints being included.
 - b. At some point in the implementation process will you address concerns of students in MS skipping 7th grade math & going into Alg. – ie. Creating gaps in understanding of concepts only taught in that grade?”

19. Tara Fair – Edmond. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric.
“Love the Glossary! Defining standards for a conceptual deeper understanding – terrific!! – will need to work with middle school teachers in a vertical capacity to sustain rigor at this level.”

20. Shirley Simmons - Norman. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric (Clarity) “Very specific. (Measurability) Yes, but it will be a big task to get items written. (Progression) Very easy to see progression (Focus) We will need to realign our MS courses so students don’t miss content.”

21. Barbara Cusick – Ponca City. All guiding questions were met positively on rubric
This will be easy for new teachers to understand and implement. (Progression) Excellent. Color coding is great, vertical alignment will be an asset to teachers.

OKLAHOMA ACADEMIC STANDARDS MATHEMATICS FOURTH DRAFT

MATH RUBRIC (Reviewed 1/11/2016)

22. Deborah Cornelison - All guiding questions were met on rubric.

“Introduction to math standards – organization and descriptions promote clarity & understanding of the vision and guiding principles, standard overview, mathematical actions, processes – throughout PK -12. Typing corrections – pg. 19, 3.GM.2.6 – count X; pg. 21, 4.A.2 – 2 periods at end of standard description. Nice job!”

23. Stephanie Schutt – All guiding questions were met on rubric.

“Glossary of terms very helpful. Wondering if having ELA and Math use different format is an issue? Elementary teachers must interpret 2 styles. Many references to “real world” applications – do not see reference to “other curricular areas. Sample of consulted works cites “ACT”, Should this document be referenced to demonstrate alignment?”