

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

September 28, 2018, 8:30am – 3:30pm, John Stanford Center for Educational Excellence, Room 2765

September 29, 2018, 8:30am – 3:30pm, JSCEE, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Commons

### **Committee Members in attendance (9/28):**

*Adoption Coordinator:* MaryMargaret Welch; *Curriculum Specialists:* Christine Benita, Alisha Taylor, Brad Shigenaka; *K-5 Committee:* Cynthia Adams, Danielle Alon, Nell Baughn, Charles Bosse, Rebecca Christl, Heather Christothoulou, Trent Comer, Catherine Comings, Emma Cornwell, Angie DiLoreto, Paula Eisenrich, Kelli Elder, Ruby Geballe, Charrie Gibson, Chelsea Gilgore, Andrea Hildebrandt, Debbie Nelsen, Lissa Ongman, Hiromi Pingry, Greg Pittman, Jeannie Revello, Holly Sawyer, Geoffrey Smith, Carolyn Whipple; *6-8 Committee:* Megan Batty, Matt Brewer, Marnie Campbell, Mark Collins, Emily Elasky, Charlie Ellis, Eric Fisk, Aimée Hall, Sara Hoofnagle, AJ Katzaroff, David Ketter, Katie Koressel, James Lai, Girard Montejo-Thompson, Dana Nelson, Marjorie Olmstead, Anastasia Sanchez, Alder Strange, Brad Street, Julia Ward, Karen White.

### **Committee Members in attendance (9/29):**

*Adoption Coordinator:* MaryMargaret Welch; *Curriculum Specialists:* Christine Benita, Brad Shigenaka; *K-5 Committee:* Cynthia Adams, Danielle Alon, Nell Baughn, Charles Bosse, Lina Castro, Rebecca Christl, Heather Christothoulou, Catherine Comings, Emma Cornwell, Angie DiLoreto, Paula Eisenrich, Kelli Elder, Charrie Gibson, Chelsea Gilgore, Lissa Ongman, Hiromi Pingry, Greg Pittman, Geoffrey Smith, Anna Wallace, Carolyn Whipple; *6-8 Committee:* Jolene Anderson, Bruce Bishop, Matt Brewer, Marnie Campbell, Mark Collins, Emily Elasky, Charlie Ellis, Eric Fisk, Aimée Hall, Sara Hoofnagle, AJ Katzaroff, David Ketter, Katie Koressel, Girard Montejo-Thompson, Dana Nelson, Brandie Nordstrum, Marjorie Olmstead, Anastasia Sanchez, Alder Strange, Karen White.

### **Day 1: September 28**

#### **Meeting commenced – Review of Instructional Materials Candidates**

The Adoption Coordinator welcomed the Committee, and after an icebreaker activity, introduced a common set of norms for collaboration.

A review protocol was introduced: focus units were identified for each instructional materials candidate. The intention was to provide a common frame of reference for each of the candidates. At the K-5 level, a K-2 life science unit and a 3-5 physical science unit were identified for review. At the 6-8 level, a physical science unit (6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> grade) and a life science unit (typically 8<sup>th</sup> grade) were identified. The intent was to randomize the candidates and put each candidate through two separate, independent reviews. The numbers would be averaged between the two reviews to help the committee make a determination of which candidates to move to the next phase of the adoption process: field testing. While no firm number was established, it was agreed that more than 2-3 field tests per grade band would be logistically prohibitive.

The Adoption Coordinator suggested a protocol in which a candidate could be eliminated from consideration. This would involve two separate teams, independent from each other and without knowledge of each other's work, reaching consensus that the candidate materials were not appropriate to continue the review process. If this condition was met, the candidate would be removed from the review pool.

Prior to the meeting, the Curriculum Specialists conducted a review on an unnamed candidate to test the review criteria tool. They shared general observations and advice to the committee to help them in their review process, including common pitfalls and challenging components of the criteria.

An electronic version of the review criteria tool was introduced, which now includes a hyperlinked glossary for many of the technical terms. The committee reviewed a suggested timeline for the day's work, with the goal of completing work on a candidate by the end of the first day.

The committee was divided into teams, with each team comprised of both teachers and community members. Each team was then randomly assigned a candidate for review.

## **Meeting Adjourned**

Members worked in their teams to do a comprehensive review of their assigned candidate. Any that finished early were randomly assigned a second candidate for review. The Curriculum Specialists collected the completed review criteria as teams completed their work. Members completed an exit survey.

## **Day 2: September 29**

### **Meeting commenced – Review of Instructional Materials Candidates, continued**

The Adoption Coordinator welcomed the Committee and introduced slight changes to the teams from Day 1 based solely on the difference in attendance numbers.

Teams that were in the process of a review returned to their work. Other teams were randomly assigned another candidate for review. Work continued through the day.

## **Meeting Adjourned**

The Adoption Coordinator provided a status report to the committee at the end of the meeting: 8 out of the 11 K-5 candidates were still in need of a second review, and 7 of the 10 6-8 candidates were still in need of a second review.

Based on the fact that the next meeting was a shorter evening meeting, the Adoption Coordinator proposed that to save time, the Curriculum Specialists could conduct the second review of any candidates identified to be removed by the first review team (“low flyers”). A discussion commenced, and the committees voted unanimously to approve this amendment to the protocol.

Members completed an exit survey.