

## **Instructional Materials Committee Meeting Agenda and Minutes**

Date: Thursday, March 31, 2022

Time: 4:00 pm

### **Present (via Microsoft Teams):**

Darcy Brixey, Chair, IMC

Caleb Perkins, Co-chair, IMC

Jen Beatty, Parent Representative, IMC

Andrea Young, Notetaker, Instructional Materials Specialist, IMC

Kyle Wang, Parent Representative, IMC

Elissa Farmer, Math Program Manager

Jim Meyer, Math Curriculum Specialist

Bethany Sjoberg, Science Program Manager

### **Absent:**

Charmaine Marshall, Principal Representative, IMC

William Jackson, Principal Representative, IMC

### **Agenda:**

- **Agenda Overview, Darcy (4:00-4:05)**
- **Science Update, Bethany Sjoberg, Science Program Manager (4:05-4:10)**
- **K-5 Math Adoption Update, Elissa Farmer, Jim Meyer (4:10-4:40)**
- **Action Items: Vote to Approve the Selection of the K-5 Math Curriculum Adoption Committee, IMC**

## **MINUTES**

### **Science Update, Bethany Sjoberg, Science Program Manager**

Bethany Sjoberg introduced herself as the new Science Program Manager and gave an update on the recently adopted Chemistry A materials. Chemistry A is teacher developed and part of the adoption was to further develop and improve the materials. Efforts have included revising formatting of documents, revising directions and questions within the material to clarify content, improving consistency in use of terms, conventions and vocabulary, improving scaffolding and support for mini lessons where students require more support, and reviewing any copyright feedback. Revisions are available in Schoology for further review.

Caleb clarified why the IMC is being given an update – because there was a provision in the original science adoption Board Action Report (predating current IMC) that the material would be further developed and updated, and the IMC would be briefed on those changes.

Bethany said she would have further updates for Chemistry B in the future.

### **K-5 Math Adoption Update, Elissa Farmer, Jim Meyer**

Jim Meyer first announced that the adoption committee has selected a curriculum. Their decision is confidential until the board meeting when they present their findings.

During previous IMC meetings, the IMC approved the adoption timeline, communication/engagement plan, adoption committee members, and selection criteria. In this meeting, the IMC will vote to approve the selection of curriculum made by the K-5 Math adoption committee.

After the last IMC meeting, the adoption committee narrowed the field to 3 candidates and used their selection criteria (phase 1 ADA compliance and tech compatibility, phase 2 bias and standards alignment, phase 3 community and staff feedback). They did a community needs assessment and a staff needs assessment. These needs assessments informed the committee-developed criteria.

During Phase 1 (ADA compliance), one vendor was eliminated. During Phase 2 (bias and standards alignment), three other vendors were found to have biased materials or did not align with standards. The remaining three vendors progressed to Phase 3, which included another round of community feedback on materials, as well as staff feedback on materials. They found that the community and staff feedback reinforced the selection of the three remaining vendors (in that they were most popular with feedback). Caleb asked if the implication of people choosing not to review materials from a certain vendor means that they have a worse opinion of those materials. Elissa clarified that it was more likely that staff/community members who did reviews only put in reviews for materials that they were familiar with because of waivers or experience using it in another district. Community and staff were given the chance to review all vendors, but in some cases people only chose to review vendors they were more familiar with. This feedback was both positive and negative. For example, in the first round of community feedback, even though all seven vendors were listed, reviewers often skipped over some vendor names in order to comment on the vendors they were more familiar with. Regardless of the number of reviews submitted, all vendors received feedback and both negative and positive comments.

Field tests were conducted for all three remaining vendors: Reveal Math, i-Ready Math, and enVision. The field tests started in February and included representative sampling of teachers in the field (years of teaching experience, geographic region, student demographics for each classroom). They asked the teachers to keep a journal for qualitative data, as well as quantitative data. Curriculum specialists visited the classrooms where the field tests were being conducted so they could observe the teaching, and they interviewed students in the classrooms. They also did a standards-based assessment of the students and looked at how the students did on the assessment (how much did they learn?). There wasn't a tremendous difference between the three when it came to field testing.

Family and community engagement was occurring at the same time, through family focus groups and displays at public libraries around the city (Public libraries were chosen because schools were not accessible to the public due to Covid-19 protocols). There were paper feedback forms at the libraries (as well as online) in 6 different languages. There was a QR code at the displays that could be scanned to get more info as well. There wasn't a lot of community or staff feedback through the public viewing process, so they did family focus groups to get more feedback from the public. These happened at schools on 3 Saturdays and they partnered with the Seattle Housing Authority and the Family Engagement group at SPS for these focus groups. They asked Madrona, Concord, and South Shore to recommend family groups who were multi-lingual, African American, and who has students participating in SPED to participate. They looked at in-class materials, at-home activities (including videos), family letters, and student experience (was it enjoyable and engaging?) and took surveys on the family reactions to the materials. Families and students were able to have translators/interpreters on hand during the focus groups. The first 3 questions were for parents, the last question (student experience) was for the

student. At the end, they asked them to record an interview using FlipGrid of their reactions to the materials. They transcribed the responses from the video and turned it into quantitative feedback. enVision was the most popular curriculum during the family focus groups.

In the last K-5 Math adoption committee meeting, on March 28<sup>th</sup>, the adoption coordinators asked the adoption committee to review the initial screening results, field test, additional data, and public review feedback. The additional data included reviews from curriculum specialists, vision services, and the digital learning team.

The adoption committee's initial screening results, field test, additional data, and public review feedback were all quantified with numerical scores for each curricula. The committee met and debated the different curricula, they voted and discussed dissenting votes. They were looking for 75% agreement to attain consensus. They did a preliminary vote and then voted to eliminate the 3<sup>rd</sup> place curriculum. They then went to a final vote on the last 2 candidates and went through several rounds of votes to achieve 75% consensus, and ultimately voted to adopt enVision.

Kyle Wang asked if they thought it was risky to adopt something the district doesn't have experience with – Jim explained that the curriculum they selected is one that is already in use at the middle schools, as well as some elementary schools which have waivers. Darcy asked if Jim and Elissa could give a summary of what they mean by waivers for those who may be unfamiliar with the waiver process. Elissa gave a brief overview of the provision in school board policy (Board Policy 2020) for the waiver process that allows individual schools to apply to use something other than the adopted curricula if they think it isn't working for their students. Jen asked what the impetus for adopting new curriculum – Elissa said Math In Focus (the last adoption) was not the first choice of the last adoption committee, it's not aligned with standards, a lot of schools were being granted waivers, and there's also a new, completely different version of Math In Focus (which to use would basically require a new adoption). Elissa mentioned that enVision was the previous adoption committee's choice as well. Kyle asked about sample size with the polling, and Elissa said that yes, sample sizes are smallish compared to the Seattle population, but they did family focus groups to get more feedback from community members who had students who would be using the materials, while making sure they got feedback from families furthest from educational justice, as well as who have students in SPED programs.

Jim showed a timeline of the steps the adoption committee went through so far, including future steps (May 4<sup>th</sup> Board Action Report, and May 18<sup>th</sup> Vote to approve Board Action Report).

Elissa briefed the IMC on the relevant parts of board policy 2015 and how it applies to the criteria the adoption committee used. She mentioned the anti-bias screener they used and talked about the district obligation to provide equitable access to a high-quality curriculum to all students. They talked about aligning their goals with the district strategic plan and talked about the goal to represent the diversity of students and contribute to the development of understanding of issues relating to gender, ethnic, cultural, occupational and religious groups. Elissa said the district uses culturally responsive learning and they used those criteria in their selection of the materials. None of the materials were perfect in that sense, but they chose the one they thought was best of the candidates. Part of their goals are also to facilitate teaching of materials so that all students feel their identities are reflected and valued in their learning.

Caleb thanked Elissa and Jim for their presentation, and the IMC moved on to voting.

**Action Items: Vote to Approve the Selection of the K-5 Math Curriculum Adoption Committee, IMC**

Darcy reminded the group of the duties of the IMC, which is to approve the process the adoption committee used and make sure they followed the process they outlined as well as policy 2015: the adoption timeline, communication/engagement plan, adoption committee members, and selection criteria.

Darcy asked the group if they felt confident in taking a vote and the IMC answered in the affirmative.

Caleb moved to approve the work of the adoption committee and to certify for the school board that the adoption committee followed board policies 2015 and 0030, and Jen seconded. The vote was taken and passed unanimously by all members present.

Caleb said he will reach out to the members who were absent, as well as the legal team to see if anything needs to be done to include absent members' votes or if they are by default abstaining from the vote since they did not view the presentation.

Darcy noted that June 14<sup>th</sup> is the planned IMC Summer quarterly meeting.

Darcy moved to adjourn at 5:06 pm, and the meeting was adjourned.

Addendum, April 20, 2022:

After a brief discussion with Legal, it was agreed that statements of approval could be accepted and added as an addendum to the minutes. Although the vote was unanimous, a statement of approval was submitted by Principal Charmaine Marshall on Monday, April 18, 2022:

Please note my approval of the K-5 Math Adoption Committee's selection.

Sincerely,

Charmaine

*Charmaine C. Marshall*

*Principal*

*Bryant Elementary School*