

Board Special Meeting
Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee of the Whole
April 30, 2019, 4:30 to 6:30pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center
2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134



Minutes

Call to Order Committee of the Whole

1. Call to Order

Director Geary called the meeting to order at 4:30pm. A quorum was in attendance.

Superintendent Juneau, Directors Harris, Burke, Mack, DeWolf and Geary were present; Director Burke participated by phone.

Director Harris arrived at 4:35pm, Director DeWolf at 4:40pm, and Director Pinkham at 4:38pm, Director Patu at 4:55pm.

This meeting was staffed by Chief Academic Officer Dr. Diane DeBacker, Science Program Manager MaryMargaret Welch, Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction Dr. Kyle Kinoshita, Acting Chief Legal Counsel Ronald Boy.

Director Geary opened the meeting explaining the process of moving the Board Action Reports (BARs) out of committee, to the full Board for consideration and approval/ intro and action.

Discussion regarding amending the agenda followed, including adding the following:

- I. Sup. Juneau presentation
- II. District introductions
- III. Special attention items to include Board questions

Director Mack moved to approve agenda as amended, Director Geary seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

I. Superintendent Juneau Presentation

Superintendent Juneau commented on an email inviting the Board to visit Denny Middle School to observe Amplify science in action. She shared photos and a video showing students working, and commented on student engagement, instructional materials, instructor strengths, and reiterated the invite to visit a class to the Board.

II. District introductions

District Introductions opened with Dr Kyle Kinoshita and Dr. DeBacker's comments.

Dr. Kinoshita indicated his wish to devote the bulk of the time to committee questions.

Dr. DeBacker thanked the C&I committee for moving these bars to committee of the whole. She outlined the Board Action Report (BAR), noting the time passed since the last science curriculum adoption in SPS. She touched on the State science standards updates, and work done to respond to that criteria.

Dr. Kinoshita echoed Dr. DeBacker's comments, emphasizing evidence supporting staff recommendations. He referenced other curriculums adopted previously for English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics: all that had evidence alignment with standards, evidence of usability, evidence of student engagement. As long as the adoptions had strong evidence of the three qualities, any shortcomings could be easily remedied. He also noted that all selections may be adopted without modification to School Board Policy No. 2015, including the district-developed selections, which went through the competitive process outlined in the policy. He spoke about engagement in the process of compiling science materials and noted that critics of science efforts did not avail themselves of opportunities for review and feedback, despite opportunities.

Ronald Boy, Acting Chief Legal Counsel, spoke about the instructional materials adoption. He indicated that the law and Seattle Public Schools (SPS) policy were followed. He explained the policy and the law around the Instructional Materials Committee (IMC). He indicated that perceived conflict of interest and bias or perception of bias, were investigated, and dismissed.

Dr. Kinoshita noted that the record showed that the Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction (CAI) department worked to improve communication and engagement with the Board, and concluded his remarks recommending the committee move the BAR forward for consideration.

III. Special attention items to include Board questions

Director Mack thanked staff for their work agreed that new materials are needed. She spoke about the need for policy and governance, and asked about process, the Instructional Materials Committee (IMC) and the State RCW about instructional materials, and delegation of authority. She asked why Board Policy No. 4110 doesn't apply to this committee. Mr. Boy spoke about the makeup and expectations of the IMC having its own policy instead of deferring to another policy authority.

Director Mack asked who makes up the IMC, who appointed them, and she read the charge of that committee. Dr. Kinoshita told the panel that the IMC is a standing committee since 2015, for ELA and Math adoptions; he will pass on the names to the Board.

Director Mack also asked about timeline of this adoption process. Ms. Welch indicated the vendor had made errors around timeline, regarding whether a school was piloting or in an active waiver. She went on to explain evaluation criteria and IMC oversight, recommendations made to the superintendent who brings that recommendation to the Board.

Director Harris asked about schools under waiver – when were they put in place and when was the Board informed about that. Ms. Welch indicated the waivers were applied for in April 2016. A 3 year Math Science Partnership grant gave teachers the opportunity to working bring instructional materials into alignment with the 2013 Washington State Science Standards (NGSS).

Director Harris asked again when the Board was informed. Dr. Kinoshita indicated that was included in a report in Jan of 2017

Mack asked about the process of reporting to the Board vs. committees. Dr. Kinoshita said it is routine that the C&I committee receive reports on existing waivers, and in this case it was reported in January 2017. Ms. Welch spoke on School Board Policy No. 2020 regarding approving waivers.

There was discussion on how were the instructional were materials funded. Ms. Welch indicated the purchase order attached to the Board materials for one-year license for waiver students being valued at \$120,000. She spoke about material kits and older materials being re-purposed so there was no cost for the physical laboratory materials.

There was discussion around criteria and principles, tech-based requirement for computer-based simulations, and screen time substituting for hands on instruction.

Dr. Kinoshita spoke about criteria guiding principles; multiple modes of learning, reading, writing, hands-on activities, and that technology-based activities are just one of a number.

Director DeWolf asked what teachers are saying about Amplify. Ms. Welch pointed out that there were many teachers in attendance in the audience of the meeting who were supportive of Amplify Science. These teachers believe the materials offer the most equitable access for students, especially for our most vulnerable students.

Director DeWolf indicated emails he gets are supportive of Amplify. Ms. Welch spoke about the controversy around this adoption and its impacts.

Director Harris commented on the negative effect of polarizations and went on to stress that the Board is doing fiduciary duty and is required to approve curricula.

Director Geary invited up Ms. Kathleen Vasquez, ELA and Social Studies Program Manager, to speak about the K-5 English language adoption; which she noted was exemplary. Asked about process and policy around adoption, Ms. Vasquez spoke about her experience in the adoption process and IMC and noted that Ms. Welch had obtained extensive information about the K-5 ELA adoption from her team and believed that the science adoption was following a similar protocol to ELA's. Director Harris noted the ELA and Mathematics adoptions didn't have an anonymous donor or blanket waiver policies.

Director Burke had questions on subject matter and thanked staff and Board for their hard work. He inquired whether waiver schools have materials identical to field tested materials? Ms. Welch indicated they did, and Director Geary pointed out field test schools were asked not to supplement but to teach as intended.

Director Burke spoke about overcoming disadvantages and further indicated science is on a pedagogical shift and likened it to similar shifts in other subjects; we need to acknowledge the concern that is at the root of this theory of actions are student outcomes. Ms. Welch pointed to state standards requirements. She indicated that the Amplify Science materials were evaluated by the committee to align to the standards, and that strong content knowledge is an essential component of learning. There was further discussion on the overlay and implementation of the materials- noting all instructional opportunities don't have to be on a computer.

There was discussion around evaluations and accountability; i.e., If this curriculum has been used for three years, it was implied that there should be clear indications if the gaps are closing, and our students are ready for working in the STEM fields. Further discussion took place regarding aligning to standards.

Ms. Welch spoke about the University of Washington grant and teachers shifting their practice and measuring attributes of these shifts in practice. During field test case studies, students were asked if the instructional materials were making a positive impact on their learning, and she expressed pride in the data received from students on their use of waived materials.

Director Mack followed up on benchmarking and the importance of data in scientific instruction materials. She expressed concern regarding decisions made on feelings and asked whether the data pool is self-selecting with regard to the preponderance of community and teacher emails "Who is taking the time to write?" She went on to inquire of waiver schools; if there is the claim it's improving outcomes, she would like to see that data, wants to know if it's growth data and if it has been evaluated by the adoption committee. Ms. Welch pointed out that SPS never had common assessments in science material because older curriculums don't have assessments built in. Therefore, there is no data to compare to prior materials. She indicated that although there is a proficiency scale using Amplify assessment pre and post assessment data which by being online is available immediately as a formative assessment tool and not a punitive.

Director Mack asked about a survey summary.

Director DeWolf asked for clarification whether there is evidence a committee was conspiring around certain curriculum. Ms. Welch explained the process of soliciting materials, and how a committee evaluates proposals. The 11 candidates in elementary curriculum and 10 candidates for 6-8 were vetted and reduced to 3 finalists. All 3 were field tested.

Director Pinkham referred to the handout, asking how Amplify scored and inquired was there a lowered standard to close opportunity gap? Ms. Welch and her team conducted an analysis of the grade 8 State assessment data. She indicated that Research & Evaluation department is helping the team make sense of this data.

She pointed out the pre/posttests included in the attachments to evaluate the field test materials are not the same assessments as there was not the time to create one for all the field-tested material. The assessments that accompanied each instructional material were used for pre-post-testing.

Director Burke spoke to need for continuity of assessment tools as they're getting different results and inquired as to the possibility of evaluating waiver and non-waiver classrooms? The data is currently broken down by school. He went on to speak about the Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science (WCAS) and its district wide aggregate and inquired if it can be broken between Amplify and non-Amplify schools. Ms. Welch noted that though the team had run out of time to have that ready for this meeting, they could produce that data.

Director Mack asked whether data is available if it's the policy for the adoption committee to review this as part of the criteria to choose Amplify. Ms. Welch replied that the pre-post assessment data wasn't used as a primary criterion as each material used differing assessments; the ones that were available in each of the candidate materials.

Director Geary closed the Special Attention Item portion of the meeting and asked for a discussion of the committee on each BAR: Elementary, Middle and High School Adoptions.

2. Board Action Reports (Discussion and/or Action)

a. Approval of Elementary School Science Instructional Materials Adoption

Ms. Welch indicated she would present the key points and include budgetary notes.

It was noticed additional copies of the BARs were not available at the meeting. Director Geary recessed the meeting at 6:07pm in order to provide a five-minute break for additional copies of the BAR to be provided. The meeting re-convened at 6:18pm

Dr. DeBacker opened discussion on the Elementary School Science BAR with a recommendation to adopt.

Director Geary invited Directors Burke and Pinkham to speak and there was discussion on budget and professional development (PD) that would be provided to teachers. Ms. Welch was asked about the 5-million-dollar price for the professional development. Ms. Welch explained that the model proposed for the roll out of elementary included 1450 teachers over 5 years and was based on what is best practice in the field. Dr DeBacker shared that this amounted to approximately \$500 per teacher. Ms. Welch indicated they would explore all the options for PS including potential use of Microsoft Teams, subject matter specialists, or other models of PD.

There was discussion on assessments and field testing, and Ms. Welch explained standards bundling. She reported on a teacher panel discussion and the robust nature of the assessment.

Director Burke asserted the Amplify assessment package needs a richer assessment and asked for transparent field test results. He also noted Amplify is a full 12 points below lowest competitor

and asked for scoring rubric. He also inquired if the results in the first stage rubric was used in the aggregate scoring of the selection process. Ms. Welch replied that the second stage of the process started over with a field test and stage 2 assessment and then held a vote with the committee.

Director Mack asked about the rubric and scoring; whether it was included in the information they have on the dais and asked for a summary attachment with final scoring. Ms. Welch indicated this was in the BAR attachments.

Director Burke re-iterated he had reviewed the numbers and determined that Amplify scored 12 points lower than competitors on the first stage. Ms. Welch explained the evaluation criteria, field testing, and the voting process used for the selection. She noted that they selected standards aligned material after much discussion prior to a by vote.

Director DeWolf asked for discussion on the strategic plan, targeted universalism and asked whether Amplify aligns with Board Policy No. 0030 and whether the inclusion of equity analysis tool was used in the selection. Ms. Welch indicated that it does align and gave specific examples within the review criteria used for evaluation.

Questions were concluded with Director Mack asking for scoring for the material assessment rubric summary to be added to the BAR. Ms. Welch said these could be supplied.

There was discussion around cost, printed material, non-consumable material, assessments, licensing and access.

Director Pinkham motioned to move forward the Elementary School Science Instructional Materials Adoption to the full Board with a recommendation for consideration. Director Burke seconded. The motion passed 2 – 0 – 1 with Director Geary and Director Pinkham voting aye and Director Burke abstaining.

b. Approval of Middle School Science Instructional Materials Adoption

Dr. DeBacker opened discussion with a recommendation for approval.

Director Burke asked about cost break out by year, with attention to professional development.

Director Mack asked for clear benchmarking for middle schools; those with a waiver that distinguished between ‘adopted’ or ‘currently piloting’ along with data that shows their outcomes if adopted. She further inquired about field testing, assessment around all units and their content, and to what depth did adoption committee review the content; whether it was entire content or more of a snapshot.

Ms. Welch reported the review more of a snapshot on the first round, then all content was looked at throughout later evaluations.

Director Harris inquired whether the PD expense was per teacher, per year for each of these and will it be required? Staff indicated it will need to be negotiated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

Cashel Toner spoke about CBA requirements around required PD and recommends staging the implementation carefully to work around other required PD.

Director Harris asked what PD is required.

Dr Kinoshita spoke about required hours which led to further discussion around PD, its requirements and whether is negotiated in the CBA. He stated he would research.

Director DeWolf opened discussion on racial equity with regard to curriculum and the focus on students of color and English Language Learners (ELL) students which led to discussion of sense making and these students seeing themselves in the work.

Director Mack appreciates the pedagogy and content and asked about the additional supplemental materials needed to support various students. She also asked about content rigor and where in the criteria was the content evaluated. Robert Eagle Staff teacher, Karen White was invited to speak on 6th grade content and simulations. Ms. Welch led discussion on content evaluation and availability of materials.

Director Pinkham asked about whether the cost of the package is per teacher or per student which led to another discussion around cost and growth projections.

Director Geary asked if Special Education (SPED) classrooms are being built into the licensing count and expressed her concerns to the merits of using out of district data to review Amplify. Dr. Kinoshita spoke to the cutting of the current budget of curriculum adoption funds but that the \$5 million allocated covered the adoptions.

Directors Pinkham and Burke asked for clarity on budget by year and Director Burke asked about student workbooks, and budgeting. Brad Shigenaka, Science Curriculum Specialist was asked to speak to the cost of printed student workbooks and Ms. Welch spoke to the merits of digital (printable) material over printed books; which were not needed. There was discussion about cost shifting from instructional materials budgets to school budgets for copying, and Ms. Welch noted that with teachers making up curriculum the copy costs were much higher.

Director Geary asked for a motion to move the Middle School Science Materials Adoption BAR forward for consideration. Director Pinkham motioned to move this BAR forward to the full Board with a recommendation for consideration. Director Burke seconded. The motion passed 2 – 0 – 1 with Directors Geary and Pinkham voting aye and Director Burke abstaining.

c. Approval of High School Science Instructional Materials Adoption

Dr. DeBacker read the recommended motion to adopt High School Adoption.

Director Burke asked about technology and if curriculum depends on individual student access to laptops. He stated that he thinks children benefit from digital learning opportunities. Ms. Welch explained that access to a computer is required for assessment data.

Director Mack asked about the scope and sequence and adaptation to Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate (AP IB) and how this can be adapted for Advanced Learning (AL). Ms. Welch spoke about middle and high school collaboration for Highly Capable (HC), discussion of the possibility of a one-year acceleration 'single domain giftedness' and whether science is a component of HC.

Director Burke motioned to move Approval of High School Science Instructional Materials Adoption forward to the full Board with a recommendation for consideration. Director Pinkham seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

Director Geary adjourned the meeting at 7:23 pm.