

## K-5 Math Curriculum Adoption Committee

January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Minutes

Eighth meeting of the K-5 Elementary Math Curriculum Adoption Committee

January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022 5:00pm - 8:00pm

Held as a remote meeting via Microsoft Teams

**SPS Staff members present** Priscilla Allen, Emily Cordova, Fredrick Ngobi, Bryan Getchell, Katlin Hanger, Olivia Ivie, Yushen Liu, Aschenaki Lulu, Cynthia Fitzsimmons, Nicole Malmgren, Caitlin O'Shea, Elizabeth David, Kenneth Maldonado

**Community members present** Theresa D'Agostino, Bob Findlay, Isis Lara Fernandez, Marianne Wilson, Megan Luce

**Adoption coordinators present:** Elissa Farmer, Jim Meyer

**Absent :** Luisa Hoffmann, Rachel Pitts, Dawit Alemayehu

1. Members reviewed the agenda of goals for the meeting.
  - Review results of the committee designed evaluation tool
  - Review Staff and community feedback
  - Sub Committee Presentations
  - Recommend which publishers will continue in our process and be Field Tested in SPS classrooms
2. The committee took time to define what would make up a recommendation for a field test.
  - The belief that a publication might be the best choice for students
  - The belief that additional positive information might be revealed by field testing with students and educators
3. The Committee reviewed the summary quantitative results of the Evaluation Tool that was developed in earlier meetings and applied to our three remaining candidates. All scores on a scale of 0 - 2
  - Reveal Math: 1.51 - 75.5%
  - Ready Math: 1.48 - 74%
  - enVision Math: 1.57 - 78.5%
4. The committee moved into break-out rooms based on sub-committee membership. The goals of the sub-committee break-outs were:
  - Review their own category scores and comments and return to the full committee with a recommendation for each publisher based on their category findings and scores and prepare for questions.
  - Develop questions for category sub-committees other than their own.
  - Review public and staff input to inform a final decision.

5. Upon return from breakout groups, sub-committee members presented their recommendations for each publication. The committee heard additional comments on each category and the sub-committee answered direct questions about their category and their findings. Committee members kept personal tallies of their recommendations to field test based on each of our seven evaluation categories.
6. When the committee had heard from all seven category sub-committees, there was a motion to advance Reveal Math onto the field test. The motion was seconded. The committee approved to move Reveal Math onto the field test unanimously.
7. Next was a motion to advance Ready Math onto the field test. The motion was seconded. The committee voted but did not reach a unanimous consensus. Per our decision-making process, we allowed 5 minutes of discussion for each dissenting vote. The committee heard concerns over support Ready Math offered to teachers and students. Counter arguments pointed to positive community feedback.
8. There was a second motion to vote on Ready Math again. The motion was seconded. The second vote did not yield a 75% consensus to move forward with Ready Math. Nor did it yield a 75% consensus to not move forward with Ready Math.
9. A motion was made to vote on enVision – and return to Ready Math later. The motion was seconded. The committee voted to advance enVision Math to the field test. The committee voted but did not reach unanimous consensus to advance enVision Math to the field test. Per our decision-making process, we allowed 5 minutes of discussion for each dissenting vote.
10. The dissenting opinion of enVision Math shared concerns over questionable translations into Spanish and an unrelenting focus on STEM subjects, to the exclusion of other applications and uses of mathematics that may have broader cultural importance.
11. There was a second motion to vote on enVision Math again. The motion was seconded. The second vote yielded a 75% consensus to move forward with enVision Math.
12. A motion was made to advance Ready Math to the field test to gather further information from teachers, students, and families – or – to return to our evaluation process and re-evaluate the product hoping to develop a more decisive opinion that may help the committee reach consensus. The motion was seconded. The vote passed to advance Ready Math into the field test. The committee voted, and the motion passed – to advance Ready Math into the Field Test.
13. The committee celebrated.
14. The committee reviewed the timeline for the remainder of the adoption process and agreed to reconvene in March to hear testimony from staff, review data from students and families on all three publications and make their final recommendation to the School Board.