

**Report of the State Board of Education
Committee on Mathematics (Ad Hoc)
Meeting
Monday, August 18, 2025**

The State Board of Education Ad Hoc Committee on Mathematics met at 9:26 a.m. on Monday, August 18, 2025, in room 2.006 of the Barbara Jordan Building, 1601 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas.

Committee Members Present: LJ Francis, chair; Staci Childs, Keven Ellis, Tom Maynard

Committee Members Absent: Pam Little

Other SBOE Members Present: None

Member Childs offered prayer, and Chair Francis offered introductory remarks, noting that the purpose of the meeting was the consideration of TEA Staff Presentations, particularly as they relate to Charge #4:

Charge #4 – Recommendations for Improvement

Provide recommendations to address identified weaknesses, focusing on:

- i. Strengthening explicit instruction and scaffolding practices to better align with cognitive load theory.
- ii. Embedding the science of math and other techniques, such as precision teaching, feedback loops, reinforcement schedules, and progress tracking, to improve student engagement and self-regulation.
- iii. Enhancing spiraling techniques to support conceptual connections and skills retention across grade levels.
High Quality Instructional Materials and IMRA Deep Dive
Bluebonnet Overview.

Colin Dempsey, Director, District Operations, Technology, and Sustainability Supports, presented on the following topics:

1. IMRA TEKS Alignment & Review
2. IMRA Quality Rubric Overview
3. IMRA Mathematics Quality Rubric
4. IMRA Evidence Guides Overview

IMRA TEKS Alignment & Review

Mr. Dempsey noted that is important that materials cover 100% of the student expectations for the grade level or course as determined by the SBOE for full-subject, tier-one materials. Partial-subject, tier-one materials must cover 100% of the student expectations identified for the grade level or course, and supplemental materials must cover at least one of the student expectations, and must cover 100% of the student expectations which the publisher claims to cover.

Mr. Dempsey explained the knowledge and skills strands, and how they are read, explaining that breakouts are the smaller parts of the larger SE that outline what students should know and be able to do to demonstrate grade-level proficiency. He noted that publishers must provide two citations for each breakout, one narrative and one activity citation. He provided rules for how student expectations are divided, based on the conjunctions used in the breakout rules. He also discussed the differences between narrative and activity citations.

Mr. Dempsey then reminded Committee members that HB 1605 established 3 categories of instructional materials, full-subject, tier-one; partial subject, tier-one; and supplemental. He noted that this year, reviewers are evaluating products that fall in the full-subject, tier-one and supplemental categories.

IMRA Quality Rubric Overview

Quality review rubrics are based on what educators tell TEA they need to effectively implement instructional materials, combined with evidentiary best practices. This is broken down into two “design categories,” Implementation Quality and Learning Quality, the latter of which is unique to the subject being reviewed.

IMRA Mathematics Quality Rubric and IMRA Evidence Guides Overview

Mr. Dempsey then walked the Committee through the Quality Review Rubric for Math K-12, explaining each section, and discussed Evidence Guides, which can clarify expectations, support consistency, guide evidence collection and provide clear point allocations.

He concluded by pointing out that high-quality instructional materials in mathematics are designed to cover the math student expectations found in the TEKS, and the quality rubric is the foundation of the quality review, while the evidence guide supports rubric application.

He concluded by noting that final reports of IMRA reviews will be presented to the Board in November.

In response to a request, Mr. Dempsey agreed to provide a crosswalk of educational terms to ensure that everyone is using the same language.

Following Mr. Dempsey's presentation, Mr. Nick Keith, Executive Director of High-Quality Instructional Materials, presented a deep dive on Bluebonnet Learning's mathematics materials. He presented some of the challenges when educational materials are not aligned with student learning research, and the benefits of such alignment. He noted that Bluebonnet's approach is based on this student learning research and provided specific examples from the K-5 Math Progression.

He noted that there were assessments at mid-module and end-of-module to ensure that students are gaining the appropriate knowledge. He noted that Bluebonnet has four defined parts of each lesson: Fluency Practice, Application Problems, Concept Development, and Student Debrief, and that this approach is somewhat unusual among other mathematics materials. He presented the Teacher's Guide next, including a module overview, common student misconceptions, terminology, and detailed lessons. He noted that everything a new teacher would need to teach the course is included in the Teacher Edition.

Student books include fluency practice, problem solving and problem sets, and homework and practice. He noted that every homework assignment has a "parent helper" section to allow parents to be better able to assist their children with math homework.

The teacher's guides are developed to allow the teachers to "internalize" the content prior to teaching it.

Mr. Keith then walked through the secondary math guides from Bluebonnet, concluding by showing the Bluebonnet Learning Portal, which allows open access to all Bluebonnet Learning instructional materials for any Texan, with no login necessary.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.