

03-17-21 Meeting Notes

Time	What?	Notes
1:30 Intro Stuff 1:30- 1:40	<p><b><u>Welcome and Thanks!</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you</li> <li>• Assist with notetaking? Record</li> </ul>	<p>Laura is taking notes. Angie is chat moderator In attendance: Jessica, Holly, John, Angie, Laura</p>
	<p><b><u>Tech Orientation</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Tech Norms</u></b></p>	<p>Resources in Files of General Channel of our Team</p> <p>If Back to School plans get in the way of our 3/31 meeting, we may have to postpone it. Tentative alternate date is 5/26 or on a day other than a Wednesday.</p>
	<p><b><u>Content Objectives:</u></b> Participants will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Define and refine individual and collective ideas about <i>rigor</i> in Chemistry</li> <li>2. Apply their understanding of the Prescreening Criteria to <b>one material</b> with promise in small groups</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Language Objectives:</u></b> Participants will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Write</b> a description of rigor and <b>discuss</b> their ideas with a partner, then revisit that description after reading and discussing additional stimuli.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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</li> </ol>	<p>We decided to postpone the rigor conversation until we can have more voices.</p>

	instructional materials and pedagogies that are aligned to science standards.	
	<p><b><u>Team Norms:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using the hand raise when you want to speak</li> <li>• Keep an open mind</li> <li>• Limit distractions if possible</li> <li>• Be honest</li> <li>• Assume positive intentions</li> <li>• Listen for understanding</li> <li>• Ask questions</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Next Meeting Schedule:</u></b></p>	
<b>Time</b>	<b>What?</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<p><b><u>Pre-screening STEMscopes Choice:</u></b> CA version or Integrated Version?</p>	<p><b>Blue:</b> CA version that has Earth Science folded into a three year sequence of Bio, Chem, and Physics (similar to model that we use, as negotiated in 2016); units are called segments; everything is translated into Spanish but no other languages (we chose this one to review today)</p> <p><b>Green:</b> Integrated version that has more scopes (chapters); units are called bundles; not everything is translated into Spanish</p> <p><b>Both:</b> Scopes are chapters. Missions are Anchoring Phenomena.</p>
	<p><b><u>Prescreening Criteria review</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We're looking for evidence of those criteria in STEMscopes Chemistry</li> <li>• Remember - not "how I would use these materials to teach..." but do the materials have evidence to support</li> <li>• Scoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0 no evidence of this criteria</li> <li>1 minimal or almost no evidence of this criteria</li> <li>2 occasional or inconsistent evidence of this criteria throughout</li> <li>3 consistent evidence of this criteria</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>See Navigation Guide that Angie made for us in the Committee Prescreening tab under STEM Scopes. We used Segment 4, Structure and Properties of Matter and Reactions and Energy (2 scopes).</p> <p>Note that the 5Es that STEM Scopes uses are different in focus than the original 5Es that Roger Bybee articulated and researched.</p>

	<p>4 consistent and compelling evidence of this criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small group task</li> </ul> <p><b>Navigation:</b></p>	
3:30	<p><b>Large Group conversation</b></p> <p>Return to the large group at 3:40:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What agreements do you see?</li> <li>What questions need to be asked?</li> <li>Can you individually commit to a score for each prescreening statement? Be prepared to share evidence to support your score</li> </ol>	<p>Returned at 3:00</p> <p>Felt like the boiling liquid phenomenon wasn't very compelling but it did drive instruction. Glow stick was better.</p> <p>We appreciated the large anchoring phenomena and the little daily ones.</p> <p>Seems like a lot of energy throughout the course!</p> <p>The connections between concepts was strong- energy connected to reactions and molecular structure.</p> <p>Balancing equations is introduced very early (at the very start of the year) and stoichiometry is introduced in the second segment but is not a big part of the unit on reactions and energy.</p> <p>Mission log was strong to help them center their learning and figure out how the pieces are fitting together. However there were missed opportunities for students to ask their own questions and drive their own learning.</p>
	<b>Closure:</b>	