

Middle School Math Textbook Adoption- Meeting #4- May 16th

Present:

SPS committee members: Jenna Velozo, Sara Burke, Jasmine Riach, Wendy Miller, Lisa Kadobayashi, Anita Koyier-Mwamba, Hillary Graham, Travis Sims, Julie Gatti, Seth Bundy, Jennifer Brown-Mendoza

Community members: Andrew Reder, Frederic Ngobi, Charity Allen, Jacqueline Shin, Felix Darvas, Philip Kong, Carol Cheyne, Colleen Bettis, Kim Fergus, Phyllis Lewis, Helen Gerety

Old Business

Reviewed **minutes** from May 2nd committee meeting

- Motion to provide summary statement at the beginning of the section about the “Anti-Bias Screener.” This summary should indicate number of curricular materials that passed.
- Motion voted on and approved

Revisited **needs assessment** survey from meeting 1. Anna suggested adding some needs assessment summary comments to the meeting #1 notes. Members expressed discomfort at sharing even summary comments as they are concerned that certain populations are over represented in the survey. Members asked to have 3 options to consider regarding the sharing results of the survey:

- 1) Add the summary to Meeting 1 minutes
- 2) Add the summary to Meeting 1 minutes with a statement explaining that the results may be skewed. The summary statement might be: There was an effort to get feedback from community on important aspects of a middle school math book. This effort garnered limited feedback from neighborhoods south of the ship canal. The committee fears the results were likely skewed due to a lack of response from a large segment of the overall community. We are attempting to address that by attending community meetings and actively seeking input from those groups appearing to be missing in the survey result.
- 3) Do not add a summary of the survey to the minutes. Instead only add the statement explaining that the results might be skewed.

The committee asked to vote via email on these three options for adding needs assessment survey results to the meeting 1 minutes.

Preparation to revisit some materials using the SPS Anti-Bias Screener

1. Examined **math trend and demographic data** from OSPI Report Card. Committee members noticed:
 - There’s a huge gap between percent of white students proficient and African American students proficient
 - The category of blacks/African Americans is comprised of native born kids and first generation students
 - Gap is very consistent; what efforts and initiatives have been undertaken to narrow it?
 - Is there information that shows data around performance and poverty levels?
 - Would like to see data comparing white and other groups in addition to African American students
 - Important to review these trends to frame the work using the anti-bias screener because if there is a gap between any group of people is unacceptable and a textbook can be a tool to help students feel represented. Hopefully materials will help us meet the needs of all our students.

2. Read a section of ***Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain*** by Zaretta Hammond. In table groups, committee members used a protocol to distill out a key word from the reading. Each committee member wrote their word on a piece of paper and was asked to refer back to it during the day.

Second review of programs that had not yet passed the anti-bias screener

1. Committee members began reviewing ***Core Focus*** using anti-bias screener. After discussion, using the committee decision-making protocol, a secret vote occurred.

Pass: 6

Not Pass: 14

Abstain: 2

Result: ***Core Focus* did not pass the anti-bias screening.**

2. Committee members began reviewing ***Eureka (Great Minds)*** using anti-bias screener. After discussion, using the committee decision-making protocol, a secret vote occurred.

Pass: 1

Not Pass: 20

Abstain: 1

Result: ***Eureka* did not pass the anti-bias screening.**

3. Committee members began reviewing Glencoe Math using anti-bias screener. After discussion, using the committee decision-making protocol, Glencoe Math passed the anti-bias screener with consensus and no secret ballot was required.

Result: ***Glencoe Math* passed the anti-bias screening.**

4. Committee members began reviewing Open Up using anti-bias screener. After discussion, using the committee decision-making protocol, a secret vote occurred.

Pass: 1

Not Pass: 19

Abstain: 0

[Note: two committee members had to leave and were not present for this vote.]

Result: ***Open Up Math* did not pass the anti-bias screening.**

Programs that passed the anti-bias screener:

- Big Ideas Math
- Connected Math Project 3
- EnVision
- Glencoe Math
- Go Math
- Math in Focus

The window for **community review** is open and community members could possibly be reviewing materials that are no longer in consideration for adoption as they have been removed.

- Motion to leave all original nine textual materials in the community feedback forms to avoid the confusion that will undoubtedly come if the feedback form is changed at this point.
- Result: Did not pass. Anna was asked to remove programs that did not pass the anti-bias screener from the community feedback form and extend the survey window until the end of the month

Committee members moved to their affinity groups to review and rate remaining textual materials for criteria established by the committee in Meeting 2.

<p><u>Content-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jenna Velozo • Sara Burke • Seth Bundy • Felix Darvas • Travis Sims • Jennifer Brown-Mendoza 	<p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kim Fergus • Jon Moor • Frederic Ngobi • Valerie Mackam • Wendy Miller • Anita Koyier-Mwamba
<p><u>Teacher Tools and Resources</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jasmine Riach • Lisa Kadobayashi • Hillary Graham • Carol Cheyne 	<p><u>Family and Community & Culturally Responsive</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helen Gerety • Lynn Rody • Phyliss Lewis • Philip Kong • Jacqueline Shin
<p><u>Student Needs and Accessibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin Rasmussen • Julie Gatti • Charity Allen • Andrew Reder • Colleen Bettis 	

For the remainder of the meeting, committee members reviewed materials for these criteria.

Meeting ended at 3:15