

## **K-5 Math Curriculum Adoption Committee**

March 28th, 2022, Minutes

Tenth meeting of the K-5 Elementary Math Curriculum Adoption Committee

March 28, 2022 5:00pm - 9:30pm

Held as a remote meeting via Microsoft Teams

**SPS Staff members present:** Priscilla Allen, Emily Cordova, Fredrick Ngobi, Bryan Getchell, Katlin Hanger, Olivia Ivie, Yushen Liu, Cynthia Fitzsimmons, Nicole Malmgren, Elizabeth David, Kenneth Maldonado, Rachel Pitts, Aschenaki Lulu, Caitlin O'Shea

**Community members present:** Theresa D'Agostino, Bob Findlay, Marianne Wilson, Megan Luce, Dawit Alemayehu

**Adoption coordinators present:** Elissa Farmer, Jim Meyer

**Absent:**, Isis Lara Fernandez

**Guest Speakers:** Tara Hoffman

1. To begin what is planned to be the final meeting of the K-5 math Curriculum Adoption Committee, and to reconnect before making difficult decisions, the committee re-introduced themselves to their fellow members and shared what had been the most surprising experience for them throughout this process.
2. The Committee reviewed the adoption timeline to better understand the process after their recommendation is made. It was made clear that the recommendation would take the form of a board action report. This report would be routed through several departments and the desk of Superintendent Jones before being presented to the Student Services, Curriculum & Instruction Committee on April 26<sup>th</sup> and the full school board on May 4<sup>th</sup>.
3. The committee reviewed details of the partnership with Seattle Public Libraries during the field test and reviewed the feedback and comments left by community members and SPS staff regarding the three finalists.
4. The committee heard from Tara Hoffman – SPS math curriculum specialist – about the partnership with Seattle Housing Authority to meet with families whose voices we specifically wanted to hear; families with students who are multi-lingual, African American, qualified for special education. These are the voices we did not want to lose in the volume of the overall community feedback.

Tara's team met with 30 families to share examples of classwork, family letters, digital resources, and home assignments from each of the three finalists. Tara shared specific feedback about each of the finalists and the overall preference shared by families.

5. The Committee prepared to make their final decision with an activity that sorted all the information gathered over the course of their work. Ultimately the information was sorted into four silos: the K-5 Instructional Materials Evaluation, the field test data, the public review feedback, and additional data from SPS departments (Digital Learning, Vision Support, Technology and Systems...)
6. The committee looked at each piece of data within each silo and ranked it from highest to lowest. (Example: Student Assessment Results – was placed inside the *Field Test* silo, the average student result for each publisher was ordered from lowest to highest).
7. The committee considered overall trends within and across all four silos of information before moving into breakout groups to discuss and consult specific reports or results.
8. The committee then took a 30-minute break with the task of reflecting privately on two questions:
  - a. Has new information confirmed or changed your thinking or ranking of the candidates?
  - b. How does this data impact your Committee Evaluation Scores? Complete your three evaluation forms as much as possible.
9. When the committee returned, they engaged in an activity to rank their preferences for the three candidates.
10. There was a motion to eliminate the least preferred of the three candidates. The motion was seconded and went to a vote. The vote passed unanimously. The least preferred candidate was eliminated from consideration.
11. The committee engaged in a second ranking exercise for the remaining two candidates.
12. There was a motion to recommend the most preferred candidate to the school board. The motion was seconded. There was a vote to recommend the most preferred candidate. The initial vote to did not reach a consensus.
13. The board followed the decision-making protocol to hear from each of the dissenting votes. Each dissenting vote could speak for 5 minutes followed by discussion and questions.
14. As per the decision-making process, the committee returned to the vote after the discussion. The vote failed to reach the threshold of 75% approval two times before passing.
15. The committee agreed upon a candidate to recommend to the Seattle Public Schools Board of Directors.
16. The recommendation will remain under embargo until approved by the Instructional Materials Committee (*approved April 1*), entered into a Board Action Report, approved by Superintendent Jones, and presented to the Student Services, Curriculum & Instruction Committee on April 26<sup>th</sup> and the full school board on May 4<sup>th</sup>.