

Instructional Materials Committee Meeting Agenda and Minutes

Date: Monday, March 25th, 2024

Time: 4 pm

Present (via Microsoft Teams):

Darcy Brixey, Chair, IMC

Caleb Perkins, Co-chair, IMC

Andrea Young, Notetaker, Instructional Materials Specialist

Jen Beatty, Parent Representative

Kyle Wang, Parent Representative

Patrick Gray, Jason Sciarrone,

Mei Pontano, Math department, presenter

Kathleen Vasquez, ELA Program Manager, presenter

Agenda:

- Welcome
- Adoption Updates and Reminders, Darcy
 - Presentation on Algebra 1/Geometry/Algebra 2 Math Selection, Mei Pontano on behalf of Elissa Farmer
 - Presentation on 6-8 ELA Selection, Kathleen Vasquez
- Action Items**:
 - Vote to Approve the Algebra 1/Geometry/Algebra 2 Math Selection and certify the work of the adoption committee
 - Vote to Approve the 6-8 ELA Selection and certify the work of the adoption committee

****Details of action items for each adoption:**

- Certify to the School Board that the final selection of the adoption committee was reached by following the processes and principles outlined in Board Policy No. 2015, this Superintendent Procedure and related Superintendent Procedures, General Criteria for Evaluating Textual Materials for Cultural Relevance and Bias, and Board Policy No. 0030, Ensuring Educational and Racial Equity; and
- Ensure that a professional development cycle is developed to support the implementation of all School Board-approved instructional materials.

Minutes:

Mei Pontano presented for the math department on behalf of Elissa Farmer, math department chair. The math department and math adoption committee are conducting a new adoption for Algebra 1, 2, and Geometry, and they selected a curriculum. After the presentation, the IMC will discuss whether they have satisfied all the requirements in school board policy 2015. Previously, the math department obtained approval from the IMC for the adoption timeline and communication/engagement plan (June 2023) and the adoption committee membership, and evaluation categories/criteria (September 2023). Mei described the results from the RFP (outlined in PowerPoint presentation) and the proposed material from vendors. They had 9 candidates and went through a 3-phase process (1. DOTS review and public review, 2. Anti-bias screening, 3. Committee-defined criteria and evaluation). Phase one was ADA

compliance and VPAT review, as well as data security compliance review. Four products were eliminated during this phase. Three of them were not ADA compliant, and one didn't have an updated VPAT and did not pass information security & SSO compliance review. They narrowed the candidates down to five and sent them for public review and ratings (each one was given a score by reviewers from the public). In phase two they used the anti-bias screening tool and recommended eliminating one more candidate that did not pass the anti-bias review. Two SPS math curriculum specialists reviewed each curriculum. They had concerns about one other curriculum and shared those concerns with the adoption committee and decided whether to let that curriculum move forward. In phase three, the adoption committee looked at the weighted criteria and split into subcommittees to evaluate each curriculum according to the individual criteria. Each of the criteria was given a weighted score. Category one subcommittee evaluated all five candidates for category one, for example. (There were 7 categories.) They decided to move forward with field testing three candidates. Field testing was from Feb. 1-March 1, at 6 high schools and 7 middle schools and K-8s in Algebra 1 and Geometry classes. Teachers did weekly surveys, curriculum specialists observed the classrooms, and students were informally interviewed during classroom sessions and completed a survey that mirrored relevant adoption committee evaluation criteria. Each field test teacher also gave live testimony and took questions from the adoption committee. As this is a digital-only adoption, they evaluated aspects of the digital interface and experience for users. Teachers provided ratings using the adoption committee criteria as well. Student surveys gave feedback on topics like math language support, whether the materials were fun and interesting, whether it supported diverse learning needs, and how it did with differentiation. During the same month, they did a second public review and asked for more input from families, community members and staff, and they had more feedback during this review period than during the first review period. Each curriculum was given a number rating that was given to the adoption committee. The adoption committee went to their final recommendation process and rated Illustrative Mathematics the highest, recommending that curriculum for adoption next year. This was also the highest rated curriculum during the field test and public review process. The math adoption committee also worked on year one professional development plans, which Mei outlined in her PP presentation.

Kathleen Vasquez presented the grades 6-8 ELA adoption process. Round one: identify three finalists, then field test. Round two: select a finalist, implementation: professional development. They had eight responses to the RFP (outlined in PowerPoint). All of them passed the digital learning review, VPAT compliance and ADA compliance. They moved forward with all eight candidates during the first round, which included the anti-bias checklist. This step was important because of the nuance involved with evaluating English/language arts textual materials (i.e. is a stereotype used in literature meant to illuminate or perpetuate that stereotype?). They eliminated vendors based on patterns they found, and narrowed the list down to five candidates. They looked at whether the curriculum offered diverse authors, whether they were covering diverse topics at all levels or making it so that, for example, Native American topics were only covered in one grade level. They took online feedback from staff and parents/community members about the evaluation criteria and scored everything according to those criteria. Responses to criteria were very subjective and differed between staff and parents. Overall, using the applied weighted formula, McGraw-Hill was rated highest by staff. They then released info about pricing and did a risk analysis because two of the candidates turned out to be much higher cost than in the RFP stage. They eliminated two vendors that were \$800,000 over the price value and selected three finalists. After identifying three finalists, they recruited for field testing at schools. Everyone who applied for field testing was accepted for the 5-week field test period. They assigned field

testing curriculum to each participating school. During the round two field test, the field testers engaged in a 2-hour panel discussion with the adoption committee and responded to questions aligned to adoption criteria, evaluated professional learning, and gave feedback on the curriculum itself. Currency was important to the evaluators. They selected a finalist and then looked at round two data, conducted a second evaluation of the finalists using a 4-point rubric, then incorporated findings from round one into the final evaluation. At this point, they compared the staff vs family/community favorability ratings and worked towards consensus from there. They eliminated one of the three finalists because of reports of problems with the technology, lack of instructional supports, lack of diverse text representation. In the end, they reviewed policy 0030, as well as Smarter Balanced data, read responses from field testers, facilitated whole group discussions focused on new data and survey results, and came to a consensus. They voted to adopt Inquiry By Design.

Action items:

- Vote to Approve the Algebra 1/Geometry/Algebra 2 Math Selection and certify the work of the adoption committee: Caleb Perkins moved that the Instructional Materials Committee, vote on the adoption committee's final selection to certify that the Algebra-Geometry-Algebra 2 adhered all the required processes including following policy 2015 and policy 0030. Kyle seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Vote to Approve the 6-8 ELA Selection and certify the work of the adoption committee: Caleb Perkins moved that the Instructional Materials Committee, vote on the 6-8 English Language Arts adoption committee's final selection to certify that this committee adhered to all the required processes including policy 2015 and policy 0030. Kyle seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Darcy moved to adjourn the meeting at 5 pm.