

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

September 9, 2018, 8:00am- 1:00pm

John Stanford Center for Educational Excellence 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Commons

### **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, Anna Wallace, Charles Bosse, Julie Breidenbach, Karin Britt, Lina Castro, Rebecca Christl, Heather Christothoulou, Trent Comer, Catherine Comings, Emma Cornwell, Angie DiLoreto, Paula Eisenrich, Kelli Elder, Ruby Geballe, Chelsea Gilgore, Andrea Hildebrandt, Debbie Nelsen, Lissa Ongman, Hiromi Pingry, Greg Pittman, Jeannie Revello, Holly Sawyer, Geoffrey Smith, Carolyn Whipple; *6-8 Committee:* Jolene Anderson, Megan Batty, Matt Brewer, Belinda Chin, Mark Collins, Emily Elasky, Charlie Ellis, Eric Fisk, Aimée Hall, Sara Hoofnagle, Casey Johnson, AJ Katzaroff, David Ketter, Katie Koressel, Girard Montejo-Thompson, Dana Nelson, Brandie Nordstrum, Marjorie Olmstead, Anastasia Sanchez, Alder Strange, Brad Street, Julia Ward, Karen White.

### **Meeting commenced – Review of Adoption Timeline**

The Adoption Coordinator welcomed the Committee back from the summer break and reviewed the K-8 Adoption Timeline, including upcoming meeting dates (specific locations within JSCEE to be determined):

- September 28, 8:30am-3:30pm
- September 29, 8:30am-3:30pm
- October 4, 5:00pm-8:00pm
- November 6, 5:00pm-8:00pm
- November 17, 5:00pm-8:00pm
- December 6, 5:00pm-8:00pm
- March 8, 2019, 8:30am-3:30pm
- March 9, 2019, 8:30am-3:30pm

Q&A: Will K-5 and 6-8 have to adopt the same publisher? No. When is the rollout? Staggered rollout at K-5 over three years, and targeted rollout of September 2019 for 6-8.

Based on member requests, the Curriculum Specialists announced a separate training, outside the committee meetings, called NGSS 101. This would provide committee members an opportunity to learn more about the new science standards and the related shift in the way science is taught in the classroom. The first proposed session was in August, but there were not enough interested to make it logistically possible. A new session on September 13 was proposed.

### **Introduction to Instructional Materials and Connections to the Review Criteria**

Each table was assigned an Instructional Materials sample (chosen randomly from the candidates received) to explore as an introduction to the work that the committee will be doing. A Checklist Tool was provided as a guiding tool for this exploration. The Checklist Tool, created by the Curriculum Specialists, provided major touchpoints from the Review Criteria, organized into the Criteria's five main Categories.

It was stressed that this was an opportunity to engage with and explore science instructional materials – which many committee members had never done – and that this was not an evaluation of the materials themselves.

After the activity, committee members shared out some of their groups' findings, including:

- A need for a glossary to help with terminology; Storylines should be from the start of the unit, with a phenomenon, using a series of lessons to build understanding and concluding with the explanation;
- The importance of opportunities for student-to-student discourse as opposed to teacher-to-student discourse;
- Concern about science content and models being grade-level appropriate;
- Programs using the right “buzzwords”, but on closer inspection aren't genuine reflections of the real practice;
- Need content experts on the committee to examine materials to verify that the science is accurate;
- If engineering doesn't involve a redesign phase, then it is not authentic;
- The Checklist Tool reflects our high expectations – kids deserve it and we may have to use this curriculum for a long time, which is also connected to why a digital platform is so important for regular updates to keep it current pedagogically and content-wise.

## Review Criteria Analysis and Approval

The Adoption Coordinator shared the results of the survey conducted at the June 13<sup>th</sup> meeting to determine the weighting of each of the five categories for the Review Criteria. The results were averaged to determine the final weighting:

Review Criteria Category	Weight
<b>1:</b> Standards Alignment	0.22
<b>2:</b> Assessments	0.17
<b>3:</b> Inclusive Educational Practices	0.20
<b>4:</b> Evaluation of Bias Content	0.20
<b>5:</b> Instructional Planning & Support	0.21

The Adoption Coordinator shared an update on the work since the June 13<sup>th</sup> meeting: In June, Seattle Public Schools was introduced to EdReports, an independent nonprofit whose mission is to improve K-12 education through the development of comprehensive review criteria. EdReports generously shared their early draft work with SPS. A small advisory group of teachers, all members of the Adoption Committee, convened to review the EdReports resources as well as the extensive feedback gathered from the June 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. This advisory group used both sources to revise the Review Criteria.

This version of the Review Criteria was then shared with the Adoption Committee via an online survey. Over the summer, committee members gave their input on each component by voting to either approve, reject, or approve with modifications. The science team reviewed the feedback, and based on that feedback made minor changes to the verbiage of some of the components. The Review Criteria presented at this meeting was the final product.

The Adoption Coordinator proposed a protocol for reviewing and adopting this final Review Criteria: Each of the five Categories was reviewed and voted on individually. For each, ten minutes of time was dedicated to individually reviewing the Category and writing down questions, then ten minutes of time was dedicated for each table group to discuss their questions, and to call for a member of the science team to respond or clarify as needed. Each table recorded their consensus feedback related to verbiage, which was then collected. The Adoption Coordinator then called for a vote on each Category, collected in an online survey. The results were as follows:

Review Criteria Category	#	Approve	Do Not Approve
<b>1:</b> Standards Alignment	48	45 <b>(93.8%)</b>	3 <b>(6.2%)</b>
<b>2:</b> Assessments	48	47 <b>(97.9%)</b>	1 <b>(2.1%)</b>
<b>3:</b> Inclusive Educational Practices	48	43 <b>(89.6%)</b>	5 <b>(10.4%)</b>
<b>4:</b> Evaluation of Bias Content	48	48 <b>(100%)</b>	0 <b>(0%)</b>
<b>5:</b> Instructional Planning & Support	45	44 <b>(97.8%)</b>	1 <b>(2.2%)</b>

## Meeting Adjourned

Members completed an exit survey, and the adjournment of the meeting was staggered based on each table group's completion of the voting and exit survey, as many members departed to attend the SEA union meeting at Benaroya Hall.