

## **Middle School Textbook Adoption Committee Meeting #3- May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017**

Present:

SPS committee members: Jon Moor, Jenna Velozo, Sara Burke, Wendy Miller, Jasmine Riach, Lisa Kadobayashi, Hillary Graham, Lynn Rody, Travis Sims, Seth Bundy, Julie Gatti, , Anita Koyier-Mwamba

Community members: Colleen Bettis, Andrew Reder, Frederick Ngobi. Helen Gerety, Charity Allen, Jacqueline Shin, Carol Cheyne, Felix Darvas, Phyllis Lewis

Guests present: Jennifer Brown-Mendoza

### **Review of Previous Meetings and Agreements**

- Reviewed adoption timeline
- Purpose of “anti-bias screener”: Any textbook recommended for adoption must pass the Seattle Public Schools “Anti-Bias Screener” as per Policy 2015
- Committee members reviewed minutes of last meeting:
  - Suggestion to add conversation regarding rubric and point scale
  - Correct spelling of two members’ names
  - Committee voted to approve minutes with edits
- Committee members approved having their names put on website
- Committee informed that the review criteria established at the last meeting had passed IMC with limited edits
- At the first adoption committee meeting, some members expressed concern about hearing from under-represented communities. Anna has begun conversations to increase engagement by making plans to take materials to these under-represented communities. More updates each meeting.
- Reviewed norms and air-time:
  - Created addendum to decision-making protocol to reflect monitoring air-time.
  - Move to vote; committee approved

### **Review of “Anti-Bias Screener”**

- Members reviewed the Seattle Public Schools “Anti-Bias Screener” found in Policy 2015.
- Discussion of how to apply the anti-bias tool
- Proposal: If a table-group decides that a program does not meet anti-bias criteria (ie, at least one criterion is judged as ‘never’), a whole adoption committee conversation must be held to decide if the program passes the “Anti-Bias Screener.” Committee will use its decision making protocol to decide if the program passes the “Anti-Bias Screener.” Proposal approved.

**Committee members applied the “Anti-Bias Screener” to all submitted textual materials. All nine programs were reviewed for “Anti-Bias.” By the end of the day, five programs had passed the anti-bias screening: *Big Ideas, Connected Math Project 3, EnVision, Go Math, and Math in Focus.***

**Here is detail on how the voting went and the decisions were made:**

**After teams reviewed materials, results were compiled.**

- Two programs, *Connected Math Project 3* and *EnVision*, received no scores of “never.”
- Motion: Based on this review, these two programs have passed the “Anti-Bias Screener.”
- Vote: Approved

**Regarding all programs besides *Connected Math Project 3* and *EnVision*,**

- Criteria for evaluating instructional materials using the anti-bias screener reread
- Motion: For simplification, discussion will be of “passing” or “not passing” the “Anti-Bias Screener” (rather than how many “nevers” a program received.)
- Vote: Approved
- Discussion of possible anti-bias problems for each program followed by vote to pass that program
- Three additional programs passed the anti-bias screening: *Big Ideas*, *Go Math*, and *Math in Focus*

**Further discussion of the use of the “Anti-Bias Screener;” adoption committee members noted:**

- When there is a lack of diversity in a textual material, the material is not representative of our general population.
- We should look again at books that have not yet passed: *Core Focus on Math*, *Eureka*, *Great Minds*, and *Open Up Math*.
- The anti-bias tool is very important.
- Content review is separate from anti-bias review.
- When only the dominant paradigm is represented, student engagement is hard to attain and maintain.

**Motion to revisit programs that have not yet passed the anti-bias screener. Vote: approved.**

**Updates from IMC**

- The SPS Instructional Materials Committee (IMC) reviewed the adoption committee screener and feedback tools.
- IMC recommendations for the screening tool the committee will use:
  1. Articulate the algorithm used in the budget section
  2. Removing “ADA compliance” from the student needs section as the SPS Civil Rights office will perform a comprehensive review of the materials for ADA compliance. ADA compliance is critical and imperative. It will be reviewed separately from the screening toolCommittee voted to approve these recommendations and make these changes to the screener.
- IMC recommendation for the family and community feedback tool:
  1. Include a question in the “optional demographic information” section asking about the student’s math experience. For example, my student’s math experience is mostly positive, mostly negative, etc.
  2. Change the ratings of 0 = Poor, 1 = fair, 2 = good, 3 = outstanding to “No evidence,” “Little evidence,” “Some evidence,” and “Strong evidence.”Committee approved change 1 and rejected change 2.

**The meeting was adjourned at 3:45**