

Chemistry Adoption Committee Meeting 1-20-21

Proposed Time	What?	Notes	Resources
1:30 (5 min)	<p><u>Welcome and Thanks!</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you • Introductions - name, role, and ____ • Assist with notetaking? Record 	<p>Angie D. – curriculum developer/facilitator John D. – special education rep Katie K. – administrator Melissa B. – Chemistry teacher Jeannine S. – Chemistry teacher Laura B. – Chemistry teacher</p>	
1:35 (5 min)	<p><u>Tech Orientation</u></p> <p><u>Tech Norms</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • hand raise • chat moderator • thumbs vote with camera on or in forms • Question parking lot 	<p>Jeannine is monitoring the chat. Laura is taking notes.</p>	Teacher participants
1:40	<p><u>Content Objectives:</u> Participants will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apply their understanding of the "Resources to Build Common Understanding" document by providing more explanation 2. Apply their understanding of the Prescreening Criteria to one material with promise in small groups <p><u>Language Objectives:</u> Participants will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apply their understanding of the "Resources to Build Common Understanding" document by adding descriptions of teacher activities and student activities to the "more" column. 2. Read one curriculum material with promise individually, discuss in a small group and record evidence to support the claims about instructional materials and associated pedagogies are aligned to science standards. 3. By engaging in conversation and dialogue in small groups around the identified evidences of alignment to criteria, 		

	participants will develop a more complete picture of instructional materials and pedagogies that are aligned to science standards.		
1:45	<p><u>Team Norms:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the hand raise when you want to speak • Keep an open mind • Limit distractions if possible • Be honest • Assume positive intentions • Listen for understanding • Ask questions 	Note that there are a lot of distractions today.	Team Norms slide
	<u>Review Consensus Process:</u>	Thumbs up/Thumbs sideways is consensus	Consensus slide
1:50	<p><u>Update on Timeline:</u> Wednesday meetings for Prescreening</p>	Pilot testing next fall	
Time	What?	Notes:	Resources
2:00 (10 min)	<p><u>IGNITE:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When I think about the Chemistry Adoption, I would want us to be sure to be attentive to _____ because _____ 	<p>Participant responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • phenomena because student engagement depends on early connection and ability to relate • accessibility because it helps science teachers more likely engage with all learners • wet labs and hands on learning because they engage kinesthetic learners and are an expectation of our community • accessibility because we want all students to be able to learn chemistry • more rigor because important for honors and AP classes for the future • engagement and relevance for all learners because science and STEM have historically been not representative of diversity in the country and we need to hear the 	

		contributions of all the diverse ways of knowing present in the classrooms.	
2:15 (10 min)	<p><u>Pre-screening Criteria - Why</u></p> <p><u>Independent Review</u> - Suggest completing the table for what that might look like for students, for teachers, within instructional materials.</p> <p>Closure activity: crosswalk between table and prescreening table</p>	<p>WestEd, BSCS, and Achieve have together put together the TIME criteria and it's in our interest to pay attention when so many smart people agree on how to do this.</p> <p>We will get to the point of asking whether the materials have all the pieces that teachers need to teach, but right now our goal is different. We are looking for the innovations that NGSS will create in our practice.</p>	Resources to Build Common Understanding Table
2:25 (40 min)	<p><u>Prescreening Criteria review</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We're looking for evidence of those criteria in PDX STEM • Remember - not "how I would use these materials to teach..." but do the materials have evidence to support • Scoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 no evidence of this criteria 1 minimal evidence of this criteria 2 occasional evidence of this criteria throughout 3 consistent evidence of this criteria 4 consistent and compelling evidence of this criteria • Small group task • Chemical Reactions unit 	<p>Laura and Katie= group 1 Melissa and Jeannine= group 2</p>	
	<p><u>Large Group conversation</u> Return to the large group at ____:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What agreements do you see? b. What questions need to be asked? c. Can you individually commit to a score for each prescreening statement? Be prepared to share evidence to support your score 	<p>Added more language to the level 1 and 2 descriptors: 1=almost no evidence of this criteria 2=occasional or inconsistent evidence of criteria</p>	

		<p>Hard to score based on what's there and not on the potential of what we could do with it.</p> <p>Thank you to Angie for including .5!</p>	
	<p>Closing and Closing Tasks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report Individual Scores on Microsoft Forms• Review Critical Criteria - Policy 0130 https://bsd405.org/wp-content/pdf/policy/0130P.pdf		