

Seattle Public Schools Science Instructional Materials Adoption Committee Meeting (K-5 and 6-8 combined committees)

March 23, 2019, 8:00am – 4:00pm, John Stanford Center for Educational Excellence Auditorium

Committee Members in attendance:

Adoption Coordinator: MaryMargaret Welch; *Curriculum Specialists:* Christine Benita, Alisha Taylor, Brad Shigenaka; *K-5 Committee:* Cynthia Adams, Danielle Alon, Nell Baughn, Julie Breidenbach, Karin Britt, Lina Castro, Rebecca Christl, Heather Christothoulou, Trent Comer, Catherine Comings, Emma Cornwell, Angie DiLoreto, Paula Eisenrich, Ruby Geballe, Charrie Gibson, Chelsea Gilgore, Andrea Hildebrandt, Lissa Ongman, Hiromi Pingry, Greg Pittman, Jeannie Revello, Holly Sawyer, Geoffrey Smith, Anna Wallace, Carolyn Whipple; *6-8 Committee:* Jolene Anderson, Megan Batty, Bruce Bishop, Matt Brewer, Marni Campbell, Belinda Chin, Mark Collins, Emily Elasky, Charlie Ellis, Eric Fisk, Aimeé Hall, Sara Hoofnagle, AJ Katzaroff, David Ketter, Katie Koressel, Girard Montejo-Thompson, Dana Nelson, Marjorie Olmstead, Anastasia Sanchez, Alder Strange, Brad Street, Karen White, Julia Ward.

Meeting commenced

The Adoption Coordinator welcomed the Committee and reviewed the day's agenda.

Subcommittee Report

The meeting began with a presentation from Eric Fisk, representing an ad hoc subcommittee formed to address ideas proposed by member Marjorie Olmstead at a previous meeting regarding additional questions to pose to the finalist vendors. The questions included requests for additional references, inquiries about their digital infrastructures, and policies around student data and privacy. These questions were compiled and submitted to the vendors by Purchasing through an addendum to RFP Step 2. The subcommittee was made up of the following people: Marjorie Olmstead, Mark Collins, Matthew Brewer, Lina Castro, Megan Batty, Paula Eisenrich, and Eric Fisk. Nina Arens from the High School Committee was invited to attend due to her expertise in instructional technology. The Adoption Coordinator and Brad Shigenaka attended the meeting to facilitate. The Adoption Coordinator arranged to have each of the references contacted and interviewed. This information, along with the vendors' responses to the addendum questions, were reviewed by the subcommittee. Eric Fisk presented to the whole committee on the conclusions.

Four HMH, two TCI, and four Amplify customers were contacted. All reported being satisfied with their selection. Amplify stood out as being the only vendor to receive positive feedback relating to students' depth of understanding and teacher ability to observe student growth. Vendors mostly reported back what the subcommittee wanted to hear, but good issues were raised for asking districts and following up with Technology Services and Purchasing related to the contract. Eric reported out on findings regarding system integration and rollout, security, system uptime, updates, offline options, languages, device restrictions, and contractual issues. Committee members were then given time in small groups to review the responses and reference interview details.

Review and Processing of Field Test Data

The K-5 committee returned to their TCI deliberations from the end of the previous meeting while the 6-8 committee proceeded with the protocol described below. Committee members returned to their small groups from the previous meeting to review and process the additional data from the field tests, 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. They added to this new data their conclusions from the field test panels from the previous meeting.

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 each vendor 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 their committee, sharing their scoring and their conclusions about the data. Significant time was given for each team to present their analysis, ask questions and discuss the discrepancies. All three finalist posters were presented and discussed by each team.

Voting

Ballots were provided to each committee member for a vote on the recommendation to the School Board for adoption. The four options were: Amplify, HMH, TCI, and none of the above, which would be a recommendation for no adoption at this time. Members chose to vote anonymously, being able to detach their names from the ballots. The names would be tallied for the sole purpose of ensuring every member voted and only voted once, then the names would be destroyed. In the interest of ensuring integrity of the voting process, K-5 committee member and community representative Angie DiLoreto was asked to assist Brad Shigenaka in tallying the votes. DiLoreto and Shigenaka first accounted for the names against the attendance sheet, ensuring that every member of the committee cast one ballot. The names were then destroyed. They then tallied the votes, then checked each other's work for accuracy. They then signed the totals to certify the voting results.

Meeting Adjourned

Adoption Committee members concluded their work for the evening and adjourned until further notice.