

Instructional Materials Committee Meeting Agenda and Minutes

Date: Wednesday, November 3, 2021

Time: 4:00 pm

Present (via Microsoft Teams):

Darcy Brixey, Chair, IMC

Caleb Perkins, co-chair, IMC

Jen Beatty, Parent Representative, IMC

Kyle Wang, Parent Representative, IMC

Charmaine Marshall, Principal Representative, IMC

Andrea Young, Notetaker, Instructional Materials Specialist, IMC

Elissa Farmer, Math Program Manager

Jim Meyer, Math Curriculum Specialist

Antoinette Harrison, Project Manager

Agenda:

- **Presentation on Selection Criteria for Math adoption and Updates on Math K-5 adoption**
- **Votes:**
 - Approval of math K-5 adoption Selection Criteria
 - Approval of complete adoption committee
- **IMC procedural changes for new courses**

Minutes

Presentation on Selection Criteria for Math Adoption

Elissa and Jim presented their selection criteria for the new K-5 math adoption in the form of a slide show. She described their process so far (initial meetings, selection of the adoption committee, etc). She talked about their work recruiting representatives from groups like multilingual learners, dual language programs, HCC schools, special education, Title I schools, etc.). She outlined the demographics of the committee by gender, ethnicity, and programs represented. They now have 23 members in the adoption committee and will ask the IMC to approve the additional members.

As a reminder, on June 24th, after a presentation on math adoption committee recruitment and selection by Elissa Farmer, Math Program Manager, the IMC agreed to hold a virtual vote on the timeline and the communication/engagement plan. Later another vote was held virtually for the adoption committee based upon the recruitment selection presentation from Ms. Farmer. The committee voted again on 11/3 for the additional members where additional

recruitment was needed to ensure diverse committee representation (i.e. special ed, multi-lingual learners).

The committee has developed their selection criteria. The first step will be screening the materials using the anti-bias screener (using the steps outlined in policy 2015) and standards alignment using the K-8 math instructional materials evaluation tool (a nationally developed tool). They will use most parts of this tool to screen for standards alignment. After these initial steps, they'll meet and move the materials that passed those screening processes to the next step.

The second step is further evaluation: 16% approach to math learning and teaching, 16% scaffolding and differentiation, 15% instructional planning and teacher support, 14% culturally responsive instruction and culturally affirming SEL, 15% assessment, 10% community and family engagement, 14% physical and digital curriculum materials (print books, digital platform, etc.).

Each member was allowed to put in a recommended weighting for each main category. Percentages may change because a few members have not submitted their weighting. Within each category, the members developed 7 criteria for evaluating/scoring each category.

Caleb asked about category 5 – he wanted to know if they had any direct feedback from people with specific expertise on the framing for cultural inclusiveness and responsiveness. Elissa said they read policy 0030 and developed the criteria in response to that. Kyle asked about the range of scoring on the selection criteria – what is the range? Elissa said it is 0, 1 and 2. Caleb and Darcy discussed some details about use of the anti-bias checklist. Caleb mentioned that the steering committee has a number of perspectives, and that he'd like the IMC to be made aware of the work of and perspective of those people on the steering committee. Kyle asked if the word anti-racist is in the anti-bias screener and Elissa clarified that it is not. Elissa clarified the steps so far (anti-bias & standards alignment) and then the 5 selection criteria.

- A vote was held to **approve** revised adoption committee, and the vote to approve was unanimous.
- A vote was held to **approve** selection criteria, and the vote to approve was unanimous.

IMC procedural changes for new courses

Darcy outlined a change in the process for the review of new courses that the IMC should be aware of but does not need to vote. In sum, after a discussion with the SPS Legal department, we are changing the way we move forward with new course offerings, particularly those that serve fewer than 1,000 students. In an effort to align course creation and Board approval and involvement with the IMC for materials selection, once a course is approved by the Board or by the Teaching and Learning Dept, the requesting party will let the IMC chair and co-chair know what materials have been recommended for this course. They will select these materials using the criteria in Policy 2015 (e.g., anti-bias tool) and determine the IMC's involvement using the guidelines in this same policy and related procedure. In most cases, this will mean the

requesting party will email a summary of the materials selected and the criteria used for the selection to the IMC leads so that this information is included in an upcoming meeting. As a reminder related to this new process, the IMC does not look at course materials themselves, but looks at the process for selection to ensure that criteria from state and District guidelines are followed.

During the IMC discussion on this proposal, Charmaine asked about CSIP and how it correlates with the policy/process. Jen asked about general adoption evaluation criteria and whether the committee needs to recreate the criteria every time. Kyle asked about relevant documents for the IMC. In response, Darcy promised to send the committee links to the Board Policy 2015 Superintendent Procedure 2015SP.B as a reminder to the IMC that those are the guiding documents for the IMC and include the criteria for selecting instructional materials in SPS.

Caleb added a link to the policy in the chat: <https://www.seattleschools.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/2015.pdf> to provide a sense of the criteria that instructional materials need to meet.

Darcy moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:45 pm.