

## Middle School Math Textbook Adoption Committee Meeting- March 21, 2017

### Present:

Staff: Travis Sims, Lisa Kadobayashi, Wendy Miller, Seth Bundy, Sara Burke, Jenna Velozo, Jon Moor, Jasmine Riach, Lynn Rody, Julie Gotti, Anita Koyier-Mwamba, Hilary Graham, Erin Rasmussen

Parent/Community Member: Kim Fergus, Philip Kong, Carol Cheyne, Jacqueline Shin, Frederick Ngobi, Colleen Bettis, Felix Darvas, Charity Allen, Helen Gerety

Absent: Phyllis Lewis, Valeri Makam, Andrew Reder

- 1) Committee members introduced themselves and their reasons for wanting to be a member of the adoption committee; members reviewed norms for collaboration.
- 2) Review of Policy 2015 with protocol. Groups read and discussed the policy in an effort to understand the parameters of the work of the committee.
- 3) Group reviewed the adoption timeline and communication plans.
- 4) Group developed review criteria.
  - A. Using private think time, small group discussion, and review of a Needs Assessment Survey, committee members listed their top priorities in a middle school math textual resource. Note: Some members were concerned about the majority of survey participants being from certain regions of the city. Some members of the committee suggested crafting a survey for participants in other regions/underrepresented communities to complete
  - B. Committee members reviewed criteria from previous math adoptions with the goal of understanding what the screening tool might look like
  - C. Using a "token economy" protocol, members were given 4 votes to vote on what they deemed essential requirements of a textual resource
- 5) There was a suggestion from a committee member that the criteria used in the high school math adoption of 2008-09 could be used with this adoption with addition of criteria for cultural responsive and family resources. Committee began to discuss categories for review and possible weights of them.
- 6) There was a question from the committee about the SPS anti-bias tool being used as a gatekeeper in first rounds of screening.

Motion on table- Committee uses district's anti-bias tool as written as a first pass for all materials reviewed. If materials do not make it through the anti-bias screening, materials do not progress further in the adoption.

This motion passed using the committee's decision making-protocol.

- 7) Next, the committee voted on the categories to include. There was much discussion of whether or not buckets should be collapsed, especially in the case of content and pedagogy. Committee decided to eliminate pedagogy as a bucket. The agreed categories for review are:

Student Needs & Accessibility	Content	Teacher Tools & Resources	Assessment	Family & Community Resources	Cultural Responsiveness
-------------------------------	---------	---------------------------	------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

- 8) Members were advised that as per the SPS Budget office, since the total budget is \$2 Million, the cost of the textual material is to be assigned a weight of 20/100 points in the screening of materials.
- 9) Ranking buckets: Committee members listed their preferred buckets and weighted them. Committee members Felix Darvas, Julie Gatti and Anita Koyier-Mwamba tabulated the results. The results are shown in the table below:

Person	Student's needs & accessibility	Content	Teacher tools & resources	Assessment	Family & community	Culturally responsive	total
1	3	4	3	4	3	3	20
2	4.5	6	4.5	3	1.5	1.5	21
3	3	4.5	3	4.5	3	3	21
4	5	6	4	3	2	1	21
5	2	6.5	6.5	2	2	2	21
6	3.5	6	3.5	5	1.5	1.5	21
7	4	6	4	4	1.5	1.5	21
8	2	10	2	4	2	1	21
9	3	5	3	4	3	3	21
10	3	11	3	2	1	1	21
11	4	5	3	1	2	6	21
12	3.5	6	3.5	5	1	2	21
13	2	6	2	5	3	3	21
14	5	6	1	2	4	3	21
15	4	4	4	1	4	4	21
16	3	5	3	4	3	3	21
17	3	6	3	3	3	3	21
18	3.5	6	3.5	5	1.5	1.5	21
19	2	6	4	5	2	2	21
<b>Category totals</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>63.5</b>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>398</b>
<b>Category %</b>	<b>15.8%</b>	<b>28.9%</b>	<b>16.0%</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>11.6%</b>	
<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>80</b>

- 10) The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM