

Middle School Science Adoption Committee

Date: Tuesday, December 05, 2017

Central Services, Room 212

Time: 9:00 – 3:30 pm



Attendees:

- Julie Bennett, Kulshan
- Miguel Boriss, Fairhaven
- Nicole Brown, Whatcom
- Don Burgess, WWU SMATE
- Megan Butcher, Kulshan
- Meagan Dawson, Kulshan
- James Fegel, Fairhaven

- Mike Finley, Fairhaven
- Beth Insera, Shuksan
- Patricia Kadel, Kulshan & Whatcom
- Lynnelle Larson, Shuksan
- Will Middlebrooks, Shuksan
- Laurie Mueller, Kulshan
- Alli Neils-LeMoine, Shuksan

- Marit Olson, Common Threads Educator
- Andrew Rodrigues, Parent
- Doug Stark, Parent
- Sam Stoner, Whatcom
- Chad Wertz, Whatcom
- Charisse Berner, Director of T & L
- Sarah Walker, PK-12 Science TOSA

Topic	Discussion	Decision
1. Welcome and Introductions	Charisse distributed a corrected/ revised committee roster . She also provided “plus/delta” forms to collect your feedback during the day. We shared a quick positive from each member. Thank you to Patricia, Cathy Allred, Sarah and Charisse for treats!	Highlights of positives included the beautiful sunny weather, the amazing moon last night and beautiful sunrise this morning.
2. Questions about process, purpose, timeline?	No questions at this time.	No decision.
3. Review and commit to meeting guidelines and working norms	In order to do this, we revisited the vision statements developed by middle and high school teacher teams from each school in October 2016.	We updated our committee guidelines . And created a vision document .

4. Primary Evaluation of Essential Criteria (PEEC) for NGSS Instructional Materials Design (FAQ)	We read questions/answers 1 and 2 to see if any of the information in this document would help inform our vision or our screening criteria.	We identified two areas to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designing solutions to problems (engineering) and • Connecting to literacy standards for science and technical subjects and mathematics.
5. Using Phenomena in NGSS-Designed Lessons and Units	We read this document as homework and discussed big ideas and questions came up that could influence our screening criteria. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it important for all students to experience the same phenomena? What should the focus or emphasis be? • Different kinds of phenomena (Anchoring, Investigative and Everyday)—want/need examples of these • Open versus guided inquiry • If phenomena are used in the materials are they contextualizable? 	
6. Refine Screening Criteria	We synthesized the documents above and previous readings to create an updated version of the screening tool. We talked about pros and cons of using a yes/no rating and challenges of having “Non-negotiables” on a screening too. We decided to try it out.	Screening tool
7. Screen Materials	We screened/reviewed AmplifyScience (developed by the University of California Berkeley) and Dimensions (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt). Charisse sent detailed information to committee members by email for digital access to AmplifyScience.	We will be able to come back to these programs again next month.
8. Is the screening tool working?	After discussion, we decided to try a revised version of the tool next time (with a 1-4 scale, with 4 being strongest rather than yes/no).	Screening tool 2.0 version

Summary: We clarified our vision for science education. We refined our screening criteria and tool. We reviewed/screened AmplifyScience (developed by the Lawrence Hall of Science) and Dimensions (by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt). We will review other programs in January. No decisions made at this time.

Next meeting dates: January 9, 2018 - **NOTE:** Whatcom MS team is bringing treats