

Instructional Materials Committee Meeting Agenda and Notes

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2025

Time: 4 pm

Present (via Microsoft Teams):

Darcy Brixey, Chair, IMC

Caleb Perkins, Co-chair, IMC

Andrea Young, Notetaker, Instructional Materials Specialist

Cornetta Mendoza, Principal Representative (West Woodland Elementary)

Patrick Gray, Principal Representative (Catharine Blaine K-8)

Walter Chen, Parent Representative

Jesse Flores, Parent Representative

Kathleen Vasquez, presenter

Agenda:

- Welcome and introductions, Darcy Brixey
- Reminder of Instructional Materials Committee tasks, Darcy Brixey
- Presentation on K-5 ELA instructional materials selection criteria, Kathleen Vasquez

Action items:

- Vote to approve selection criteria for the K-5 ELA instructional materials adoption

Minutes:

Darcy Brixey reviewed the agenda for today's meeting and talked about what the adoption committee will be doing after the IMC votes on approval of the selection criteria. She reminded the IMC members that their role is as an oversight committee, not as subject matter experts.

Kathleen Vasquez talked about the process the committee followed to create the selection criteria. First, the adoption committee worked on building background knowledge. They talked about the district strategic plan, as well as board policy 2015, the district's racial equity policy (Board Policy 0030), and OSPI review for anti-bias and sensitivity. They talked about priorities and values: curriculum standards alignment, whether materials meet student needs, support effective instruction, reflect diversity, comply with budget and policy, and respond to stakeholder input. They read and discussed some articles about the science of reading, UDL (universal design for learning), culturally responsive practices, qualitative and quantitative measurement, and student discourse and oral language. They also talked about the different stakeholder wants/needs identified from the surveys and needs assessments, then identified priorities from that.

Criteria were grouped into seven categories, then were written, and feedback received on the first few rounds of drafts. The adoption committee members reviewed published evaluation tools for similarities and differences and revised their own criteria based partly on those evaluation tools. For the fourth draft, the committee redistributed the criteria among groups and created the fifth draft. They started with seven "buckets" or categories, and edited it down to four: Foundational Skills, Comprehension, Knowledge Building, and Writing.

For cross-cutting criteria, they had Culturally Responsive Practices, Oral Language, Assessment, and Accessibility/Usability. Each of the cross-cutting criteria should be found in each of the Content Criteria. They prioritized and weighted the categories by ranking them and then converting ranked priorities into percentages out of 100. Foundational skills: 30%. Comprehension: 25%. Knowledge building: 22%. Writing: 23%. Then they developed a “reading system.” Kathleen talked about the different “rounds” (1 & 2) for rating the larger group of vendors and then the finalists (top 3). She showed one of the criteria tools (for Foundational Skills/30%).

Walter Chen asked how the team is thinking about helping the adoption committee members think about evaluating curriculum when there is such deep content knowledge needed to evaluate using the criteria page Kathleen shared with the IMC. Kathleen said during the adoption committee selection process they asked about content knowledge of the criteria they were to use (such as knowledge of the science of reading). She shared that they usually have parents and non-teachers do more evaluation in usability and other similar areas that don't require as much content knowledge, but they try to have a balance of different types of knowledge in each small group. Cornetta Mendoza asked for clarity about what happens in the different rounds of evaluation. Kathleen said in the first round they look for vendors who don't have enough evidence that they meet the basic minimum criteria. In the second round, it's more evaluative of the criteria since they have passed the minimum standards of criteria from the first round. Jesse Flores asked about past adoption committee members' background and level of knowledge and how successful she felt they could be. Kathleen said the various levels of knowledge serve as checks and balances, and her team keeps an eye on whether the criteria meet the standards (since they have subject matter expertise). Patrick asked if anything significant came from using the racial equity analysis tool. Kathleen said not really, and it's more about clarifying the district's collective values for committee members.

Darcy called for a vote to approve the selection criteria. Patrick seconded. The committee voted to approve the selection criteria unanimously. Kathleen clarified that the next step is to create an RFP over the summer, using the criteria created by the adoption committee and approved by the IMC today.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm.