

## **Seattle Public Schools Science Instructional Materials Adoption Committee Meeting**

March 13, 2019, 5:00pm – 8:00pm

### **Committee Members in attendance:**

*Adoption Coordinator:* MaryMargaret Welch; *Curriculum Specialist:* Brad Shigenaka, Christine Benita; *Committee:* Nahom Alemayehu, Laura Bailey, Philip Bell, Judy Bridges, Aiden Buchanan, Brian Buchwitz, India Carlson, Kim Dinh, Lura Ercolano, Daniel Fisher, Jen Fox, Monica Fujii, Christine Helkey, Yolanda Jones, AJ Katzaroff, Pam Kraus, Christopher Lausted, Laura McGinty, Ruth Medsker, Maureen Munn, Rebecca Neil, Sofia Nguyen, Tiffany Robinson, Autumn Tocchi, Emily Wang, John Wietfeldt, Jackie Wilson.

### **Meeting commenced**

The Adoption Coordinator welcomed the Committee and reviewed the agenda.

### **Field Test Teacher Panel**

A teacher panel was introduced to the committee, composed of teachers that field-tested the PEER curriculum in PHYS A and PHYS B classrooms. Three teachers presented on PHYS A, two from PHYS B, and one that field tested in both courses.

The Adoption Coordinator facilitated the question and answer session, using a pre-generated list of questions that was shared with the teachers and with the committee members. Committee members took notes during the presentation, while the Adoption Coordinator ensured that every voice on the panel was equally represented. Questions that were answered in the course of responding to others on the list were then skipped to avoid redundancy and allow for time for follow-up questions at the end from the committee members.

A transcript for the panel was prepared.

### **Review and Processing of Field Test Data**

At the conclusion of the field test teacher panel, committee members returned to small groups to review and process the data from the field test, including: summary of teacher and student observations and interviews, summary of committee's scoring on the Review Criteria Tool, student growth data, student post-unit attribute survey, and any community input provided at Open Houses and Public Displays.

The committee agreed to quantify this data by applying the 0-4 rating scale used on the Review Criteria Tool, as agreed upon in their small groups. After examining the provided field test data, committee members voted on weighting considerations for each of the three main scoring categories being considered: the committee composite scoring on the Review Criteria Tool, any community feedback, and all Field Test data.

Each table was then given a poster containing a table to calculate a composite score, as well as the original committee scoring for PEER on the Review Criteria Tool. Each small group worked to reach consensus on appropriate scoring for each of the other two categories, based on their analysis of the data.

Each group then presented their findings to the whole committee, sharing their scoring and their conclusions about the data. An open discussion then took place regarding the lack of community feedback. One member raised concerns that what often happens in our community is that negative voices do not participate in either the committee process nor the feedback process, because they intend to share their opinions directly to School Board members, circumventing the entire process and elevating their voices, something that has been happening for years. Another member said that the system for collecting data could have been improved by rotating the materials between all high schools on a rotation (that was refuted pointing to the evidence that even the schools that housed adoption materials did not have input from those teachers). Another member countered that people did go to view the Public Display materials, but the librarians said that those people chose not to provide any input. It was also highlighted that in addition to the Public Displays, there were two Open Houses to provide opportunities for the community to engage committee members and teachers and to provide feedback. Furthermore, all materials were available online and input could have been given on the online portal. A separate member pointed out that protocol was followed as it was in place for previous adoptions. Another member contributed that this is why we have a representative government, that it is difficult for individuals to

contribute to the process, that we do have community input, that the committee members, the field test teachers, and all the students are community members and have provided input.

### **Voting**

Ballots were provided to each committee member for a vote on PEER to be the recommendation to the School Board for adoption for PHYS A and PHYS B. Brad Shigenaka collected and tallied the votes, ensuring that every member present voted and only voted once. 27 members were present, with 9 members absent. One member recused themselves from the voting process. The end result of the voting was 26 votes to approve PEER for recommendation to the School Board for PHYS A and PHYS B, 0 votes against, and 1 recusal.

### **Meeting Adjourned**

Adoption Committee members concluded their work for the evening and adjourned until the next meeting, scheduled for March 16, 2019.