

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

June 13, 2018, 4:00pm-7:30pm

John Stanford Center for Educational Excellence Auditorium

Committee Members in attendance:

Adoption Coordinator: MaryMargaret Welch; *Curriculum Specialists:* Christine Benita, Christine Boyll, Alisha Taylor, Brad Shigenaka; *K-5 Committee:* Cynthia Adams, Danielle Alon, Nell Baughn, Anna Birinyi, Charles Bosse, Julie Breidenbach, Karin Britt, Lina Castro, Rebecca Christl, Heather Christothoulou, Trent Comer, Catherine Comings, Emma Cornwell, Angie DiLoreto, James Dorsey, Paula Eisenrich, Kelli Elder, Ruby Geballe, Charrie Gibson, Chelsea Gilgore, Andrea Hildebrandt, Lutz Maibaum, Lissa Ongman, Karmonda Pearson, Hiromi Pingry, Greg Pittman, Jeannie Revello, Holly Sawyer, Geoffrey Smith, Carolyn Whipple; *6-8 Committee:* Megan Batty, Kristen Bergsman, Bruce Bishop, Matt Brewer, Chris Carter, Belinda Chin, Mark Collins, Emily Elasky, Charlie Ellis, Eric Fisk, Aimée Hall, Sara Hoofnagle, Casey Johnson, AJ Katzaroff, David Ketter, Katie Koressel, James Lai, Girard Montejo-Thompson, Dana Nelson, Brandie Nordstrum, Marjorie Olmstead, Anastasia Sanchez, Alder Strange, Brad Street, Karen White.

Meeting commenced – Review criteria work groups: As members arrived, they rejoined the work groups from the previous meeting, working together to do a deep dive into each of the 5 categories on the draft review criteria. Table groups worked together to summarize three topics: What the category's focus is, why it is important, and the highlights for consideration of the whole group.

Then, the whole work group for each category met to create a group poster based on these three topics.

Agenda and Goals: The Adoption Coordinator reviewed the agenda and goals for the meeting, then set the protocol for the work group presentations.

Work Group Presentations: Each work group designated two presenters, who stayed at their presentation poster and the poster versions of their category in the review criteria. The rest of the committee members rotated through each of the five work group stations to hear presentations. Five minutes was dedicated to the presentations and five minutes for questions and comments.

Individual processing time: The Adoption Coordinator amended the agenda to switch the order of the meeting. Members were given time to reflect on the presentations, to record any feedback or input, and to add it to the relevant category posters. Members were also asked to take the draft version of the Needs Assessment Survey in order to provide feedback on it.

Reviewing Exit Survey, Q&A: The Adoption Coordinator reviewed a summary of questions and comments that were submitted through the previous meeting's exit survey. The floor was opened to additional questions, comments, or concerns about the process so far and about the process moving forward.

Weighting the Categories of the Review Criteria: Members were asked to provide input through a survey on the weighting of the five categories of the review criteria by percentage.

Next Steps: Adoption Coordinator outlined next steps: taking the work done by the committee on the categories to a small work group on June 26, which would process and refine the input and revisions. A new revision of the review criteria will be made available online to Committee members in late June, with the intended format to allow for members to examine their colleagues' feedback and input while contributing their own. The process of refinement in small group will happen again at the end of the summer based on this input, with the intention that at the next Adoption Committee meeting, members will review the third (and potentially final) version of the review criteria.

Meeting Adjourned: Adoption Coordinator requested that members fill out an availability survey to help with scheduling the next Committee meeting, intended for early fall. Members were asked to engage in work before the next meeting: completing an online workshop on Eliminating Opportunity Gaps and providing online feedback on the review criteria.