

Seattle Public Schools Science Instructional Materials Adoption Committee Meeting

November 30, 2018, 8:00am – 3:30pm

Committee Members in attendance:

Adoption Coordinator: MaryMargaret Welch; *Curriculum Specialist::* Brad Shigenaka; *Committee:* Nahom Alemayehu, Nina Arens, Laura Bailey, Judy Bridges, Aiden Buchanan, Brian Buchwitz, India Carlson, Kristen Dang, Kim Dinh, Lura Ercolano, Daniel Fisher, Jen Fox, Monica Fujii, Fernando Gonzalez, Christine Helkey, Margaret Jones, Yolanda Jones, AJ Katzaroff, Greg Kowalke, Pam Kraus, Christopher Lausted, Laura McGinty, Ruth Medsker, Ryan Miller, Maureen Munn, Rebecca Neil, Sofia Nguyen, Tiffany Robinson, Autumn Tocchi, Brian Vance, John Wietfeldt, Jackie Wilson.

Meeting commenced – Norms, Protocols, Introduction

The Adoption Coordinator welcomed the Committee.

Committee members have been arranged into teams based on their self-identified content area expertise. There are 9 teams: three teams each in the content areas of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. Team members were given time to meet each other as an icebreaker helped members to self-identify their collaboration style.

The Adoption Coordinator discussed expectations of the committee members, including non-disclosure and conflict of interest. The Coordinator identified that some members of the committee have been involved in the development and/or use of one of the candidates for Biology. The Coordinator is working with SPS Legal to create a conflict of interest agreement for the committee members.

Coordinator introduced two changes to the Review Criteria. These were put forth for approval by the IMC at the same time the IMC approved the overall Review Criteria document. The IMC approved adoption of the two changes. The committee reviewed each of the changes. A voice vote was taken on each. Both questions passed with no dissent.

A discussion was held regarding criterium 3.16. After discussion, another vote by hand was taken: to either keep the criterium as modified by IMC approval, or to truncate the criterium. One vote to truncate, almost all members voting to keep it at current length.

The Committee received their first assigned candidate materials. Each team began by orienting themselves to the program, then working together to assess the program using Category 5 of the Review Criteria. The group then reconvened to discuss calibration of the rating scale (0 to 4). The whole group used their experience with this first assessment to determine a rubric defining what each rating means. This was then discussed in the whole group to establish a common definition for the rating scale.

Review of Instructional Materials

Teams then split into their workgroups to assess further program candidates using the Review Criteria. Candidates were assigned randomly within the three domains (Biology, Chemistry, and Physics).

Meeting Adjourned

Adoption Committee members concluded their work and adjourned until the next meeting, scheduled for December 1, 2018.