

## Seattle Public Schools Science Instructional Materials Adoption Committee Meeting

March 16, 2019, 8:00am – 5:00pm

### Committee Members in attendance:

*Adoption Coordinator:* MaryMargaret Welch; *Curriculum Specialist:* Brad Shigenaka; *Committee:* Nahom Alemayehu, Nina Arens, Laura Bailey, Philip Bell, Judy Bridges, Aiden Buchanan, Brian Buchwitz, India Carlson (departed meeting at 12:00pm), Kim Dinh, Lura Ercolano, Daniel Fisher, Monica Fujii, Fernando Gonzalez, Christine Helkey, Yolanda Jones, AJ Kataroff, Greg Kowalke, Pam Kraus, Christopher Lausted, Laura McGinty (departed meeting at 12:00pm), Ruth Medsker, Ryan Miller, Maureen Munn, Rebecca Neil, Sofia Nguyen, Tiffany Robinson, Jessica Thompson, Autumn Tocchi, Emily Wang, John Wietfeldt, Jackie Wilson.

### Meeting commenced

The Adoption Coordinator welcomed the Committee and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. The morning was dedicated to Chemistry (CHEM A and CHEM B) and the afternoon to Biology (BIO A and BIO B).

A committee member requested that voting be done anonymously. A hand vote was taken and unanimously supported to allow for committee members to be anonymous. Ballots were modified to have a detachable section at the top with the voting member's name. Brad Shigenaka, assigned to manage the voting and the tally process, modified the protocol so that members could choose to separate their name from the ballot itself, allowing him to ensure every member present was able to vote and vote only once, while maintaining anonymity for those who desired it.

A discussion continued from the previous meeting regarding the low count of community input. Members expressed concern about how to represent this data, balancing the voice of the community that did provide feedback while ensuring an equitable and fair weighting within the composite score. Some members expressed concern about having any weight at all, while others were concerned about calculating a zero into the weighting for programs with no community input. Others suggested normalizing the score when calculating it. One member suggested looking at the community input qualitatively vs. quantitatively, as some feedback was not expressed numerically on the forms submitted. One member discussed how to weight the one voice vs. 300 students involved in the field test. One member suggested adding student feedback to community feedback but this was not pursued by the committee.

### Field Test Teacher Panels: CHEM A and B

A teacher panel was introduced to the committee, composed of teachers that field-tested the STEMScopes curriculum for CHEM A and CHEM B. Four teachers presented on CHEM A and two from CHEM B.

The Adoption Coordinator facilitated the question and answer session, using a pre-generated list of questions that was shared with the teachers and with the committee members. Committee members took notes during the presentation, while the Adoption Coordinator ensured that every voice on the panel was equally represented. Questions that were answered in the course of responding to others on the list were then skipped to avoid redundancy and allow for time for follow-up questions at the end from the committee members.

A second teacher panel was introduced to the committee, composed of teachers that field-tested the Teacher-Developed curriculum for CHEM A. Four teachers presented on this panel. Protocols were the same as those mentioned above.

At the conclusion of the field test teacher panels, committee members discussed the implications of recommending a teacher-developed curriculum for adoption. One member asked if updates and changes would be viewable by the community. The answer was, in the short term, yes. In the long term, it would have to be part of the budget, including management of the website to ensure it is properly maintained and updated. Another member asked if voting for this curriculum would also be a vote for collaboration budgeting. The answer was that the recommendation would include funding for collaboration and professional development for the first three years of the adoption. Another member inquired about the impact to the PD budget of teacher-developed curriculum vs. publisher-developed. The answer was that each recommendation would include three years of PD regardless, so there would be no difference in the cost. Another member pointed out that much of that work had already been done by teachers in PD leading up to this point. A member asked how much teachers had been paid to develop the CHEM B program, which was not presented for

adoption at this point in its development. The answer was that the work had been done within the PD already planned, so teachers did not receive any extra pay for this work. One of the teachers on the committee that is involved in development shared that the time they have spent developing the curriculum would have been spent fleshing out other curriculum. A member raised concerns about having to pay for rights for material developed by other publishers. Another member reminded the committee that their work was supposed to be evaluated not on cost but on quality, and that much of the discussion, in their opinion, was a non-issue.

### **Review and Processing of Field Test Data for CHEM B**

Committee members returned to small groups to review and process the data from the field test for both STEMScopes and the Teacher-Developed curriculum, 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.

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 of the curricula 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 on CHEM B using STEMScopes to the whole committee, sharing their scoring and their conclusions about the data. Comments included a common red flag regarding an issue of bias in the materials that was raised during the field test. One group pointed out that 50% of students said not to use it, 50% said to change it first. one field test teacher was quoted as saying that it made them a worse teacher.

### **Voting for CHEM B**

The committee voted anonymously on the recommendation of STEMScopes for CHEM B. The end result of the voting was 0 votes to approve STEMScopes for recommendation to the School Board for CHEM B, 30 votes against, and 1 recusal.

### **Review and Processing of Field Test Data for CHEM A**

Each group then presented their findings on CHEM A, both STEMScopes and the Teacher-Developed curriculum. Similar comments were shared on STEMScopes regarding lack of equity and low student growth. Comments shared for the Teacher-Developed curriculum included that students appreciated it more, learned from it better, teachers showed passion for the curriculum, and student were excited about it and wanted to come to school and learn.

At the conclusion, there was further discussion about how to include the community input appropriately.

### **Voting for CHEM A**

The committee was presented with four options on this anonymous ballot. The end result of the voting was 24 votes to approve the Teacher-Developed curriculum for recommendation to the School Board for CHEM A, 0 votes to approve STEMScopes for recommendation, 1 vote to move neither curricula forward for recommendation, and 6 recusals. 14 of the votes for the Teacher-Developer curriculum included a recommendation for additional improvements to be made as directed by the committee.

A motion was presented to vote on similar verbiage recommending to the Board that teachers continue work on the Teacher-Developed CHEM B curriculum. This motion was unanimously accepted by the committee members present, minus Laura Bailey, who was not present in the room at the time of the vote.

### **Field Test Teacher Panels: BIO A**

A third teacher panel was introduced to the committee, composed of teachers that field-tested the Carbon TIME curriculum for BIO A. Four teachers presented on this panel. Protocols were the same as mentioned above. A transcript for the panel is attached.

A fourth teacher panel was introduced to the committee, composed of teachers that field-tested the Teacher-Developed curriculum for BIO B. Three teachers presented on this panel. Protocols were the same as those mentioned above. A transcript for the panel is attached.

### **Review and Processing of Field Test Data for BIO A**

Committee members returned to small groups to review and process the data from the field test for the Carbon TIME curriculum as described in the protocol above.

Each group then presented their findings on BIO A to the whole committee, sharing their scoring and their conclusions about the data. Comments included positive views on the curriculum, such as: after field testing, students seemed fluent in scientific practices and positive teacher feedback on the program. Much of the conversation revolved around the dearth of community feedback. A concern was raised about a specific item in the curriculum that was identified as having an issue with bias. Many committee members shared this concern, and the Adoption Coordinator flagged the issue to follow up with the organization.

### **Voting for BIO A**

The committee voted anonymously on the recommendation of Carbon TIME for BIO A. The end result of the voting was 27 votes to approve Carbon TIME for recommendation to the School Board for BIO A, 0 votes against, and 2 recusals. Two committee members, India Carlson and Laura McGinty, departed before the biology section of the meeting and were not present to vote.

### **Review and Processing of Field Test Data for BIO B**

Committee members returned to small groups to review and process the data from the field test for the Teacher-Developed curriculum as described in the protocol above.

Each group then presented their findings on BIO B to the whole committee, sharing their scoring and their conclusions about the data. Comments included positive views on the curriculum, such as: a strength is that it follows the structure of Carbon TIME, so it is seamless for students going from BIO A to BIO B. The team liked it, but it just needs help with assessments. Groups had differing opinions on how women in science were represented. Teachers were very enthusiastic about the curriculum. A student member of the committee shared that he went through the unit and though it flowed very well.

### **Voting for BIO B**

The committee voted anonymously on the recommendation of the Teacher-Developed curriculum for BIO B. The committee was presented with three options on this anonymous ballot. The end result of the voting was 25 votes to approve the Teacher-Developed curriculum for recommendation to the School Board for BIO B, 0 votes against, and 4 recusals. 9 of the votes for the Teacher-Developer curriculum included a recommendation for additional improvements to be made as directed by the committee.

Discussion after the vote included recommendation that the District focus on providing ADA compliance, copyright auditing, and assessment design support within the BIO B development plan.

A discussion began regarding next steps in the process. Committee members suggested addendums or appendices for the BAR. It was recommended that emphasis be added about how community was represented on the committee, as well as the level of expertise within the committee on the subject matter. The members suggested a list of details to share with Board members within the BAR to educate them on the decisions made by the committee and the methods used.

### **Meeting Adjourned**

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