

K-5 Math Curriculum Adoption Committee

December 4, 2021 Minutes

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

December 4, 2021 9:00am - 3:00 pm

Held as a hybrid meeting via Microsoft Teams and meeting at the John Stanford Center for Educational Excellence

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

Community members present Theresa D'Agostino, Isis Lara Fernandez, Bob Findlay, Dawit Alemayehu, Marianne Wilson

Adoption coordinators present: Elissa Farmer, Jim Meyer

Absent: Megan Luce, Kenneth Maldonado, Caitlin O'Shea, Luisa Hoffmann

1. Members who were physically present used laptops and headphones to join a Microsoft Teams meeting with members who were not physically present. The committee used this configuration in the second half of the meeting when members met in smaller groups of three to four.
2. The adoption coordinators welcomed committee members, introduced the agenda for this meeting, reviewed our meeting norms and shared important updates.
3. The first item was to review the results of the Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) findings. All digital products used in Seattle Public Schools must meet strict Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG). One vendor was could not supply a VPAT to document their compatibility. It was announced that this publisher would not move forward in the evaluation process.
4. Next, the committee reviewed the findings of the SPS Department of Technology Systems (DoTS) evaluation of the product compatibility at a hardware and software level. The RFP included a lengthy questionnaire regarding hosting, security, single sign-on capabilities, course rostering and more. DoTS approved or labeled the remaining six candidates 'acceptable'.
5. Next, the committee reviewed the findings from the Phase 2 sub-committee on standards alignment. Four of the six candidates passed the IMET screener. It was found that two of the candidates have 'some evidence' of meeting standard but not passing the IMET.

6. Next, the committee reviewed the findings from the Phase 1 sub-committee on bias in the materials. Two candidates showed serious concerns in the areas of bias, stereotype, and perspective of the student materials. One publisher was flagged by both sub-committees for concern.
7. Testimony by those who made the evaluation was heard by the whole committee.
 - Publisher A: Both sub-committees spoke of their findings, concerns, and the results of their screening tools. This was followed by questions, firsthand evidence, and closing statements.
 - Publisher B: Phase 1 sub-committee spoke of their findings, concerns, and the results of their screening tool – the Identification of Bias screener. This was followed by questions, firsthand evidence, and closing statements.
 - Publisher C: Phase 2 sub-committee spoke of their findings, concerns, and the results of their screening tool – the Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool. This was followed by questions, firsthand evidence, and closing statements.
8. There was a move for a vote to remove the three publishers from consideration according to our committee developed three-phase process. The move was seconded.
 - Proposal 1: “Publisher A **will not** move onto Phase 3 of the committee's evaluation process.” Approved unanimously.
 - Proposal 2: ““Publisher B **will not** move onto Phase 3 of the committee's evaluation process.” Approved unanimously with one abstention.
 - Proposal 3: ““Publisher C **will not** move onto Phase 3 of the committee's evaluation process.” Approved unanimously with two abstentions.
 - According to our Decision-making process, these three publishers were removed from consideration.
9. Next, there was a move that the remaining three publications would move on to Phase 3 of the K-5 math adoption committee’s evaluation process. The movement was seconded and approved unanimously.
10. The committee moved on to review the structure, scope, and the process of the Materials Evaluation Criteria that had been developed in the previous meetings. They also revisited the categories each had contributed to.
11. There was a movement that committee members agree to evaluate each remaining set of instructional materials in the category that they had contributed to and to complete evaluations in any additional category voluntarily. This was followed by a discussion of how the results would account for an imbalance in the number of evaluators in each category. It was agreed that category results would be averaged according to the number of contributors before it was weighted. The movement was seconded and approved unanimously.

12. The committee spent the rest of the meeting in category groups evaluating publishers' instructional materials using the committee's Materials Evaluation Tool.

13. Our closing agreement was to complete this work before we reconvened in the new year.