Sixth meeting of the K-5 Elementary Math Curriculum Adoption Committee
November 15, 2021 5:00 - 8:00 pm,
Held as a virtual meeting using Microsoft Teams

SPS Staff members present: Dawit Alemayehu, Priscilla Allen, Emily Cordova, Fredrick Ngobi, Bryan Getchell, Katlin Hanger, Olivia Ivie, Yushen Liu, Aschenaki Lulu, Kenneth Maldonado, Rachel Pitts, Cynthia Fitzsimmons

Community members present: Theresa D’Agostino, Lucia Hoffmann, Isis Lara Fernandez, Megan Luce

Adoption coordinators present: Elissa Farmer, Jim Meyer

Absent: Marianne Wilson, Bob Findlay, Aaron Alcorn, Nicole Malmgren

1. The adoption coordinators welcomed committee members, introduced the agenda for this meeting, reviewed our meeting norms and shared important updates.

2. Update #1: the instructional materials committee approved the evaluation process, categories and criteria developed by the adoption committee, allowing us to evaluate instructional materials submitted to Seattle Public Schools in response to our Request for Proposals.

3. Update #2: the list of publishers who responded to our request for proposals is as follows –
   - Big Ideas Math (Big Ideas Learning)
   - Bridges in Mathematics (The Math Learning Center)
   - EnVision Math (Savvas Learning Company)
   - Eureka Math (Great Minds)
   - Illustrative Math (LearnZillion)
   - Ready Math (Curriculum Associates)
   - Reveal Math (McGraw Hill)
4. Update #3 The adoption committee had completed the weighting of the categories, showing which categories would carry a greater consideration when evaluating instructional materials and which less. The weights are as follows –
   - Approach to Mathematical Learning and Teaching 16.3%
   - Clear Opportunities for Differentiation among Learners 15.8%
   - Instructional Planning and Teacher Support 15.0%
   - Assessment 14.2%
   - Culturally Responsive Instruction and Culturally-Affirming SEL 14.7%
   - Community and Family Engagement 9.7%
   - Physical and Digital Curriculum Materials 14.2%

5. At this time, we moved on to consideration of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of our screening process. As proposed, we would break into two sub-committees. Phase 1 Sub-committee would evaluate instructional materials for bias, stereotype, and perspective, while Phase 2 would evaluate instructional materials for alignment with the common core state standards and evidence of mathematical practices in the text and teacher materials.

6. Next on the agenda was to visit the webpage that had been set up for the committee to review the proposed instructional materials. This page included unique log-in credentials for each of the seven publishers. For the purposes of this meeting, we would view materials digitally.

7. Members then moved into breakout groups to explore the materials and begin to apply either the Identification of Bias screener (Phase 1) or the Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool (Phase 2).

8. The committee met again as a whole group for the last minutes of the meeting. The sub-committees committed to screening all seven candidates by our next meeting on December 3. Members learned of the option to view the physical materials in scheduled groups of two or three if they complete a daily health screening to comply with covid-19 safety protocols.