

K–5 English Language Arts Instructional Materials Adoption Committee Meeting Agenda Minutes

Date: June 7, 2025

1. Welcome and Review of Needs Assessment Survey: The meeting began with a review of the needs assessment survey data collected from both teachers and families/community members. The committee worked together to identify common priorities from the survey responses, recognizing both shared and distinct perspectives from these two groups. The committee members then examined how these identified priorities aligned with the existing **Draft 1 criteria**. As they reviewed, they noted any priorities that had not yet been incorporated into the criteria and documented them for further discussion in future revisions.

2. Content Group Assignments and Research Integration: To move forward with refining the criteria, committee members were divided into six content-specific groups, each aligned with one of the key areas critical for the instructional materials review process: **Science of Reading, Comprehension, Assessment, Culturally Responsive Practices, Writing, and Accessibility**. Each group was provided with a curated selection of articles and research to deepen their understanding of the key area they were tasked with. Members of each group self-selected from those provided, extracted key insights, and discussed these findings together. The group discussions then served to inform the initial development of **Draft 2 criteria** for each content area.

3. Review of Evaluation Tool for Alignment and Gap Analysis: Following the group research sessions, the committee reviewed a pre-existing **K–5 ELA Evaluation Tool** that is typically used by teachers to assess instructional materials. Members carefully examined the tool, paying particular attention to how the criteria were structured and distributed within it. The committee focused on determining whether the existing criteria aligned with the newly developed draft criteria, noticing any potential gaps or areas that may need further development. This review also allowed members to reflect on how the criteria in the tool were organized.

4. Development and Presentation of Draft 2 Criteria: In the next phase of the meeting, each content-specific group worked collaboratively to generate **Draft 2 criteria**. They used their research insights, feedback from the needs assessment, and their reflection on the evaluation tool to refine the criteria by consensus. Once the revisions were complete, each group presented its **Draft 2 criteria** to the larger committee. In these presentations, group members explained their revisions, provided the rationale behind their changes, and

reflected on how their work aligned with both the needs assessment priorities and the broader goals of the committee.

5. Inter-Group Feedback and Development of Draft 3 Criteria: Once each group had presented its **Draft 2 criteria**, the committee engaged in a cross-group feedback session. The feedback centered on two main areas: identifying common themes across the different content areas and highlighting any notable gaps that could impact the overall effectiveness of the criteria. In particular, members looked for areas where the criteria might overlap or where important considerations had been missed. Using this feedback, each group worked to revise and improve their **Draft 2 criteria**, incorporating suggestions and making necessary adjustments to create **Draft 3 criteria**. The revised **Draft 3 criteria** were then shared in whole group.

6. Next Steps: Asynchronous Learning and Preparation for Final Draft; Before the next committee meeting, scheduled for **June 14**, all members were assigned to participate in an **asynchronous learning experience**. This task is designed to deepen members' understanding of the criteria and help strengthen the final draft of the K–5 ELA evaluation framework. Each member will be responsible for reviewing **three additional K–5 ELA evaluation tools**. In their reviews, members will look for:

- Commonalities across the tools that could inform the final criteria
- Gaps in the tools that may have been overlooked
- Opportunities to combine information across different tools
- Potential categories or themes that could better house the criteria

This exercise will inform the committee's final discussions and revisions before the meeting on June 14.