Instructional Materials Committee Meeting Agenda and Minutes
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023
Time: 4 pm

Present (via Microsoft Teams):
Darcy Brixey, Chair, IMC
Caleb Perkins, Co-chair, IMC
Jen Beatty, Parent Representative
Andrea Young, Notetaker, Instructional Materials Specialist
Kyle Wang, Parent Representative
Elissa Farmer, Math Program Manager, presenter
Mei Pontano, Math department, presenter
Kathleen Vasquez, ELA Program Manager, presenter

Agenda:

- Welcome
- Adoption Updates and Reminders, Darcy
    - Math Update, Elissa Farmer, Math Program Manager
        - Selection of Criteria and next steps
    - ELA 6-8 Update, Kathleen Vasquez, ELA and Social Studies Program Manager
        - Update on recruitment
        - Selection of Criteria and next steps
- Preparation for action items, Darcy

Minutes:

A quorum of four IMC members was established. Darcy Brixey summarized the previous IMC meeting (June 2023) and reminded the members of Superintendent Procedure 2015SP.B and what has been done so far in compliance with the procedure. The next step for both Math and ELA is for the IMC to approve the adoption criteria.

Elissa Farmer and Mei Pontano presented an update on their process of selecting their final adoption criteria. They outlined the adoption committee's process for selecting adoption criteria for Algebra 1/Geometry/Algebra 2. The committee voted on a decision-making process, and decided to try for full consensus on all decisions. If members were to disagree, they would have a conversation, then revote and if 75% agree, it was to be considered a consensus. They pointed out that this is the same process they used during the recent middle school and elementary school math adoptions. Mei said they required two-thirds of members to be present for this process to occur. At their last meeting, they went over the selection criteria used in the past recent adoptions (K-5 math, middle school math, science, K-5 ELA). They went through three rounds of selecting six adoption categories, such as content and standards alignment, support for diverse learners, assessment, etc. (specific details can be found in adoption committee documentation). They decided to move student engagement to the piloting phase of the adoption process. They could not come to a final agreement before their meeting time was up but planned to meet again in the next few days and make a final decision. They will also decide upon and vote on category weights. Their next meeting is scheduled for 9/27/2023 and they hope to make a final decision then. Caleb asked if Elissa could explain how they viewed the difference between 'support

for diverse learners' and 'cultural responsiveness' categories. Elissa explained that support for diverse learners had more to do with language support, and cultural responsiveness has more to do with engagement or students seeing themselves reflected enough to engage them as learners. She explained that culturally responsive material might mean students might look at a relevant story problem example such as stats about college admissions or math related to fundraising for a field trip. In short, story problems that students can relate to real life situations. Mei also mentioned that the category could include examples of mathematicians who reflect the students culturally so they feel like they can relate and/or envision themselves as mathematicians. Kyle asked what student engagement means in the context of version 1 categories. Mei said there is a linked document, and she shared that document with meeting attendees. Elissa said the category overlaps with cultural responsiveness, and they were not sure they could measure student engagement looking at the materials themselves. They decided it would be better to move that category to the field test phase where they could observe student engagement.

Kathleen Vasquez gave an update about the 6-8 ELA adoption and their process for selecting adoption criteria. She gave an update on recruitment to the adoption committee – she only had two parents and the IMC agreed to allow the recruitment to remain open for the rest of the summer. They got one more parent and one assistant principal and three parent representatives. Their non-negotiables were: the curriculum must align to common core standards, conform to the district's anti-bias checklist, and have an instructional and assessment component. Usability of the digital interface also needs to be part of the criteria. They considered district initiatives and what the strategic plan says, as well as superintendent policy for selection and adoption of instructional materials. They built background knowledge by reading articles about anti-bias. They then reviewed parent and teacher surveys and discussed themes, patterns, responses from marginalized voices, and shared ideas they found in the survey data. They conducted consensus building in small groups and categorized priorities. They created five criteria. They also reviewed evaluation tools from sources such as Ed Reports, Council of Great City Schools, Oregon Department of education, and previous K-5 ELA adoption criteria. In small groups, they drafted individual categories together, then they presented those categories to the other groups for modifications. They weighed the categories, then voted on the weighted categories and the weight each category should have. They reached consensus at 75% vote by voting in Microsoft Forms. Kathleen said they are very solid on their draft but must have a final vote before submitting to the IMC. The vote is expected 9/27/2023.

Caleb asked if they included cultural relevancy in the categories. Kathleen said there was a lot of conversation about this in their meetings. She said diversity and sensitivity is one of the first things they looked at, and it is all about the text, not the teaching of the text. She said her team does not directly influence the category choices of the committee. She said while there are mentions of cultural relevancy, there is not a specific reference to culturally relevant education in the categories themselves (I.e., cultural relevancy does not 'pop' in the categories). Kathleen said it would be helpful if the IMC could express how to include that in the categories. Caleb also asked if they could make sure to include in the adoption criteria the following:

1. Meet state and district learning standards if available

2. Represent the diversity of students and contribute to the development of understanding issues of gender, ethnic, cultural, occupational, and religious groups

Caleb asked about the range of standards and whether they are included in the categories. Kathleen said standards were sprinkled throughout every section/category. Standards/instructions/tasks/materials are the fourth category, but they are also mentioned in a variety of categories other than the specific standards section. He asked that they be more formal about including those in the adoption categories.

Darcy asked if there were any more questions and went over the next steps (wait for Kathleen and Elissa to send the finalized adoption criteria, and there will be an asynchronous vote of the IMC to approve of the criteria). Kathleen asked what happens if someone says, 'I will vote yes on condition of x category being included.' Darcy said there most likely would not be a situation like that. Kathleen said she would give the committee the heads up that there were questions about cultural relevancy, etc. In the categories so they make sure to include those explicitly. Kyle asked for clarification on next steps for the IMC, and Darcy went over the main points of the duties of the IMC and the voting process.

Darcy moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:50 pm.

Amendment: The IMC voted asynchronously on 10/5 to approve the selection criteria of both 6-8 ELA and Math AGA.