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 3rd Floor Commons

Committee Members in attendance:  

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 13th meeting to determine the weighting of each of the five categories for the Review Criteria. The results were averaged to determine the final weighting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria Category</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Standards Alignment</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Assessments</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Inclusive Educational Practices</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Evaluation of Bias Content</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Instructional Planning &amp; Support</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Adoption Coordinator shared an update on the work since the June 13th 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 13th 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:

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

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.