<p style="text-align:center">Northshore School District
Curriculum Materials Adoption Committee Minutes
May 20, 2019
3:15 PM
Administrative Center Room 208</p>

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the CMAC, Curriculum Materials Adoption Committee, was held on Monday, May 20, 2019 at the Administrative Center in Bothell, Washington. Chairperson Obadiah Dunham called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Obadiah Dunham, Shelby Reynolds, Adra Davy, Tiffany Rodriguez, Bill Bagnall, Rebecca Nielsen, Nancy Dodson, Kelly Griffin, Kim Osgood, Janice Rendahl, and Sarah Takayoshi

Late arrival: Niki Arnold-Smith

Absent: Tracy Patterson, Carlos Lazo, Shannon Colley, Angie Maynard

OLD BUSINESS

Review and Approval of Minutes
Obadiah asked committee members to review the minutes from the April 15, 2019 CMAC meeting.

It was MOVED by Rebecca Nielsen and SECONDED by Kim Osgood to approve the April 15, 2019 CMAC minutes as written.

Obadiah called for the question. Motion carried.

Obadiah reviewed the agenda with members.

NEW BUSINESS: MEETING DATES FOR 2019-2020

Members were asked to review the proposed CMAC meeting date schedule for next year:

October 7, 2019
December 2, 2019
February 3, 2020
March 16, 2020
April 20, 2020
May 18, 2020
June 1, 2020 (if needed, carryover business only)

It was MOVED by Rebecca Nielsen and SECONDED by Kelly Griffin to approve the 2019-20 CMAC meeting schedule as proposed. Motion passed.

Obadiah mentioned that there are several members whose terms expire this June, including the two community members. Standard protocol will be followed for selecting new CMAC members:
- NSEA members (certificated staff) will be appointed by the NSEA president
- Administrative and community members will be appointed by the Superintendent (or designee). Applications will be solicited for interested community members through the Communications office.

NEW BUSINESS: INFORMATION PRESENTATION

Comprehensive Instructional Technology Plan
Presented by Allen Miedema, Director of Technology

Obadiah introduced Allen Miedema, Director of Technology. Allen shared that the Technology department is building a Comprehensive Technology Plan to align with and be supportive of the District Strategic Plan. One of the goals is to define how to distribute technology in a way that furthers the goals of the Strategic Plan and measures the effectiveness of use. In the past, devices have been equitably distributed to buildings, with minimal consideration for programs, etc. in the buildings. He believes that CMAC will see more curriculum submissions that also define the technology that will be required. Program evaluation will also be part of the Technology plan, to measure the effectiveness of the instructional programs and how the use of the technology contributes to that success. The intent is to measure the use of the technology rather than just distribute devices based on numbers. The Technology plan will be a high level representation of teaching and learning expectations as related to technology. Rebecca noted that CMAC is seeing more and more curriculum coming through for approval that requires technology, and we aren't aware of the plan for the access to technology for students to support the curriculum. Allen noted that the focus has changed from Technology deciding when and where devices are distributed, now they are looking for direction from the instructional side to determine a specific purpose for the technology and what is needed to support instruction.

Discussion/comments:
- How will the plan accommodate the needs to support curriculum already approved and in use, as well as new curriculum going forward?
- Obadiah mentioned as an example the *iLit* curriculum that will be presented at this meeting today, which will require access to devices as a critical component to the effectiveness of the curriculum. Allen answered that the sponsor of the material would need to write up a request detailing the need for dedicated devices, explaining how relying on existing technology in buildings would not be sufficient for the needs of the program.
- How will a building be able to request and describe the needs that already exist in a building? For instance, the fairly new elementary science curriculum has textbooks, but the more robust part of the program is online. The shared cart of Chromebooks currently available in the member's school isn't sufficient to allow consistent access to this part of the curriculum. Since this curriculum has already been approved for every elementary in the district, why should each building have to be responsible for requesting the technology to support it? Will there be a retroactive process to ensure that these needs are met? Allen answered that the process hasn't been defined as yet. Conversations are taking place in other areas of the organization, and he expects to receive more direction in that regard.
- Niki said that Allen has already met with the Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment team to determine where the needs might be, working with the department as the plan is being built. Allen anticipates that technology requests will need to align with the building SAP plan, the district Strategic Plan, and instructional program needs, and also contain a way to measure the effectiveness of the technology as it relates to that request.

- Is there a study or research that says that 1:1 distribution of devices would not cover all needs? Allen said that there is a general sense that technology should be distributed with a clear purpose, and we need to be able to show a return on the investment.

One issue is that the technology levy money isn't distributed all at once, but over the four year term of the levy, so there must be some way to prioritize how that money is spent. Allen noted that there have been many different deployment strategies among districts in the past, such as per grade level, per building, etc. The strategy in Northshore now has shifted to placing the technology in a way that supports programs, not placing it in classrooms where it may not be fully utilized.

One CMAC member expressed the feeling that this plan represents a workload issue, that staff must now jump through hoops to get the technology needed to use already approved and purchased curriculum. Allen encouraged members to share their feedback on this issue, to help inform the process.

NEW BUSINESS: PRESENTATIONS FOR APPROVAL

iLit (Inspire Literacy)
Intervention Curriculum for ELL English and English Language Development, Grades 6-12
Submitted by Elizabeth Meza, EL Coordinator and Rose Liao, ELL TOSA

iLitELL is a comprehensive, digital English language development program with a proven instructional model for grades 4-10 reading levels. It includes resources to support English learners: curriculum, assessment, data and professional development for teachers.

Elizabeth shared some highlights of the curriculum:
- Builds bridges to ELA and literacy
- Accelerates English language development
- Ensures culturally relevant pedagogy
- Accommodates and enhances inclusive practices

This curriculum is aligned with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), California English Language Development (ELD) standards, English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS), Northshore's ELD curriculum evaluation rubric criteria, ELD committee non-negotiables, and students' enthusiasm.

The technology tools are user-friendly and make instruction easier. The instructional model gradually decreases teacher responsibility and increases student responsibility. The Teacher APP has lesson plans with standards, sends activities and assessments to students, tracks student performance, and provides access to a digital library of over 1600 books in a wide range of Lexile levels. There is a Student APP that allows students access to the digital library where they can search for books at their level, they can keep a journal, take notes, use graphic organizers and instructional resources. It also has access to activities and assessments to practice and demonstrate learning. Teachers and students can connect with one another through the APPs via custom polls, surveys, teacher comments, and motivational recognition. The curriculum contains adaptive assignments that are automatically scored with feedback provided. Students have access to word study practice and games, which are personalized based on the student's level.

The Performance Dashboard monitors progress. Embedded assessments inform instruction so students continually make progress toward grade level and beyond. Instant data and reports make it easy for teachers to track progress and adjust instruction.

iLitELL provides students the opportunity to practice reading, writing, listening, and speaking every day. *iLit* has 46 different languages, students can listen to selections in both English and their own language. Specific newcomer instruction is also part of the program – 65 lessons specifically for newcomer students, includes lessons, on-screen translations, diagnostic screeners, and more. The program is adaptive - every student from newcomer to advanced will benefit from it. Teachers appreciate curriculum that can serve all levels of English proficiency. Students in the pilot found it engaging and liked the variety of books, the instant feedback, and the interactive activities.

The publisher offers multi-day training that includes one day of in person intensive training on implementation, and two days of traveling to multiple schools to address specific teacher needs. The complete online resources will be implemented in full scale the first year. The nice thing about the curriculum being online is that all updates are available immediately. Program assessments as well as state assessments and student grades will be used to determine program effectiveness.

iLitELL will replace the outdated and no longer supported *Visions,* which should be surplused. They are requesting a 6 year subscription for 400 students - $180 each x 400 students = $72,000. The multi-year license will provide a significant cost savings over the single year license cost. (Single year for 400 students = $30,000 vs. $12,000 cost per year with multi-year license).

Elizabeth has already put in a request with Technology for devices to support the program.

Questions:
- Are the translations pretty accurate? Rose said that the Chinese and Spanish seem pretty accurate.
- How are the newcomer lessons different from the others? Newcomer lessons will build the language basics: alphabet, vocabulary, phonics, as well as literacy. By the end of the 65 lessons they should be able to move on to the next level or above.

The program is laid out in such a way that students are supported in the area of phonics, which a lot of teachers in high school aren't teaching. The material is age appropriate for secondary students. Rose distributed the rubric used by the committee to evaluate the curriculum.

There was some discussion regarding the curriculum category appropriate for this curriculum (core or intervention). One member expressed concern that this curriculum requires that students have consistent daily access to technology, and based on the technology plan overview presented by Allen, it could create a problem regarding who decides which requests will be given priority. Obadiah said that from a CMAC perspective as it relates to this request, we can 1) approve it; 2) approve it contingent on the technology being available; or 3) choose not to approve it until it is clear that the technology will be provided.

It was MOVED by Kelly Griffin to approve *iLitELL (Inspire Literacy)* as Core Curriculum for ELL English and English Language Development, Grades 6-12, with the acknowledgement that technology devices will be critical to the use of the curriculum. Motion was SECONDED by Niki Arnold-Smith.

Obadiah called for the question. The motion carried.

Unique Learning Systems
Alternative Core Curriculum for Special Education FSA Program, Grades K-5
Submitted by Meghan Crane, Elementary Special Education TOSA

Teachers Callie Dunn (Woodmoor Elementary) and Casey Klinich (Cottage Lake Elementary) accompanied Meghan. Callie and Casey, along with Cottage Lake Principal Jennifer Welch, teacher Denise Cordova (Woodmoor Elementary), and Meghan comprised the committee recommending this curriculum.

Callie shared an overview of the elementary Functional Skills and Academics (FSA) program:
- 12 elementary FSA teachers (9 classrooms at Woodmoor, 3 at Cottage Lake)
- Collaborate with general education teachers to increase inclusion and access to typically developing peers
- Support students' ongoing growth in academic and life skills
- Engage in collaborative instruction with therapists, peer models, and paraeducators

There are 92 students served in the elementary FSA program. These students have disabilities that significantly impact their mastery of skills, and receive specially designed instruction in many areas: academics, communication, behavior, occupational therapy, and social skills. They work with students that have severe disabilities that significantly impact their ability to gain new skills and retain and generalize the skills they have. This requires teachers to take a gradual approach to instruction. The purpose of the committee was to "examine replacement core curriculum and special education supplements to reading, math, adaptive, and social skills that fills holes in instruction and skill acquisition for students receiving services in the FSA program and provides consistency and alignment across elementary schools and district wide special education programs, increasing access to and progress in the general education curriculum." The committee felt strongly that it is important that students with the most significant needs have consistency during their time in Northshore, so aligning with the secondary program is key.

The pilot period ran from October 2018 through March 2019, identifying student needs, researching available curriculum, and then piloting the selected curriculum and making a recommendation. There is not a lot of curriculum available for this population of students. Snow closures in February resulted in a condensed pilot timeline.

Casey shared the following teacher feedback from the pilot:
- Reading, writing, math, social studies, science, life skills, social skills all included
- Aligns with secondary curriculum, creates a continuum of services and instruction
- Literacy instruction for a variety of reading abilities – three different levels of the same program
- High student interest
- Monthly thematic units aligned with general education units
- Flexible instruction: whole group, small group, and 1:1
- Web-based, accessible on iPads (not as much "stuff" or paper)
- Benchmark Assessments

The anticipated implementation timeline calls for full implementation in 2019-20, with the following expectations:
- Complete Student Characteristics Inventory for each student on caseload
- Complete three or more monthly units
- Academic areas taught: Reading, Writing, Math, Social Studies, and Science
- Use in a variety of instructional settings: small group, whole group, 1:1
- Data collection system for at least one skill per student

The professional development plan in the implementation year includes initial training, follow-up meetings and ongoing 1:1 support. Following the implementation year, ongoing PD will be provided through quarterly meetings, 1:1 support, plus initial training for any new hires.

Funding will come from the Special Education budget and has been approved. Total cost of materials per year is $15,261.95 plus tax. Cost of professional development in the first year is approximately $20,000, which includes the cost of the trainer plus substitute coverage. This cost will significantly decrease in subsequent years as only new hires will require training.

They recommend the current core curriculum, Styer-Fitzgerald 1ˢᵗ Edition, be surplused during the 2019-20 school year.

The effectiveness of the materials will be assessed through student progress on benchmark and monthly assessments, as well as the data management system within the program in which students can be tracked by skills and progress-monitored.

The FSA Curriculum Committee is requesting approval of *Unique Learning System*, including the *SympolStix PRIME and News-2-You* components, for preschool through grade 5 FSA programs in the content areas of math, reading, writing, social studies, science, life skills, and social skills.

Technology is necessary for this program, and they are requesting six devices total per classroom. They will be working with Technology to increase the allocation of devices. Currently the allocation per FSA classroom is two Chromebooks, plus a desktop and 3 iPads. This program works best with Chromebooks, so a net increase of four per classroom is desired.

Casey noted that the benefit of this curriculum over their current core is that the current curriculum is basically just an assessment, while ULS also provides actual instruction and curriculum.

Comments by CMAC members who reviewed the material:
- It was not intuitive to move around in the system. Meghan mentioned that it is definitely beneficial to have training in the program, that it is necessary for teachers.
- The material doesn't seem to be diverse (for instance, songs included were only Christmas songs), and there was some generalization of cultural references.
- This particular population of students needs the consistency that this curriculum provides with the secondary students.
- Family structures, etc. seemed fairly old-fashioned, but there is evidence that they are working to make parts of it more contemporary.
- One member noted that she really likes the *News-2-You* portion of the curriculum, which brings it more into the contemporary frame.

It was MOVED by Rebecca Nielsen to approve *Unique Learning Systems,* to include the *SymbolStix PRIME* and *News-2-You* components, as Alternative Core Curriculum for Special Education FSA Program, Grades Preschool - 5. Motion was SECONDED by Nancy Dodson.

Obadiah called for the question. The motion carried.

iReady Assessment
District Required Assessment for Reading and Math, Grades K-8
iReady Instruction
District Supplemental Curriculum for Reading and Math, Grades K-8
Submitted by Niki Arnold-Smith, Asst. Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, and Derek Tucci, Asst. Director of Assessments

The purpose of the K-12 Assessment Pilot was to select assessment tools to support NSD Strategic Plan Goal 2 Building Block 4: Data-Informed, Needs-Based Resource Allocation. The K-12 Assessment Work Team committed to *"…implement structures to increase effective use of data to drive instructional decisions at the district, school, and classroom levels, and to promote consistent use of data by students to assess their own learning, define improvement opportunities collaboratively with their teachers and families, and continuously monitor their own progress."*

The Assessment Work Team includes administrators, teachers, TOSAs, and members of the Instructional Technology Department. Their charge was to identify tools for
- Progress monitoring in academic areas such as reading and math
- Screening tools for areas such as reading, math and writing
- Assessments that promote career and college readiness
- A resource bank of both formative and summative assessments developed for use by instructional staff at their discretion.

The team began work in January of 2018, and created a vision for their work:

We envision district-wide assessment practices that:
- Provide students, teachers, and <u>families</u>, with easily interpretable results that highlight areas of strength and areas of growth;
- Enable teachers to identify rates of growth through summative and formative assessments;
- Align with standards and curriculum;
- Are inclusive of students' differences and use methods that are appropriate for different student groups;
- Support and inform common, calibrated district-wide reporting practices

First up was a needs assessment – is there a need to do anything different than we are currently doing? All teachers and administrators were surveyed, and these were the top priorities identified:
- Continuity between grade levels to determine growth
- Common assessment K-12 in reading and math
- Bridge data between elementary/middle school/high school
- Common K-5 Math assessment

Once the needs were determined, they developed screening criteria to be used when identifying tools:
- General Assessment – what does it do, does it do what we want it to?
- Test Administration – what is the process like for the teacher, the students?
- Results – are the results easy for teachers, principals, kids, families to understand?
- Support Beyond the Test – what is available to the teacher to inform instruction?

Derek drew attention to the Assessment Criteria Rubric that was included in the packet of materials he had distributed earlier to CMAC members.

Before beginning, they used a screener developed by an independent group to help identify products to consider. Derek reviewed some of the key criteria used to screen out products that wouldn't meet the needs identified. They then invited publishers to present, scored using the screeners, and chose two assessments for piloting this year. Over 200 teachers were interested in piloting. They were able to include all teachers interested, which provided a variety of different student groups for the pilot. *STAR* and *iReady* assessments were the assessments chosen to pilot in 2018-19, along with the instructional component of each. Pilot teachers were given the option of also piloting the instructional component. After each pilot they held a parent/community night to gain feedback from

the community. In April 2019 they assessed pilot teachers to gain their feedback on how the piloted materials met the criteria.

Pilot Representation: 213 Total Participants
- 136 elementary, 63 middle school, and 14 high school participants
- All elementaries and middle schools were represented, along with two high schools
- All elementary grade levels were represented

Overview of Results:
- 84% of pilot teachers selected *iReady*
- 5.33% selected *STAR*
- 2.67% selected neither
- 8% said not enough information to make a recommendation (the snow closures experienced in February were during the *iReady* pilot, so some teachers weren't able to complete the assessments by the time the data was needed for the recommendation)

Derek reviewed the *iReady* data for the four key questions on the survey:
- 81.6% of pilot teachers agreed that reports identify student strengths and weaknesses related to content standards in Math
- 69.7% of pilot teachers agreed that reports identify student strengths and weaknesses related to content standards in Reading
- 86.8% of pilot teachers agreed that reports help differentiate for students who needed additional support or extension
- 85.3% of pilot teachers agreed that the reports inform their instruction

Overview of *iReady Assessment*
- Screens student's skills in reading and math in relation to grade level standards
- Monitors student progress and growth throughout the year
- Provides instructional groupings by needed support for students
- Informs instruction
- Provides supplemental lessons for individual gaps in student learning

Niki shared a video overview of the *iReady* assessment and instruction. Niki said that they believe that the assessment data gives really rich material they can dig into for each student, telling teachers what the student can do and what they need to continue to work on. They recognize that this is not meant to be the only thing to be used with any student, but a way to diagnose where a student is at a given time.

Though the assessment is the focus for the work team, as they talked to teachers it became clear they also needed to look at the instructional component as a supplemental resource.

iReady Instructional Component Overview:
iReady Online Instruction provides a personalized learning pathway for students based on their Diagnostic results. Online Instruction targets skill gaps to help students who are behind access grade-level content, and it provides challenges and enrichment for students who are on grade level.

Derek noted that the most important instruction given to a student is by the teacher. *iReady* is meant to fill in gaps so that students are ready to receive the curricular instruction by the teacher. *iReady Instruction* is only intended to be used for 35-45 minutes per week.

iReady has required professional development, to be implemented as follows:
- Initial Training (August): - 3 hours of centralized training focused on administering the *iReady Assessment*
- Results Training (October) – push in model at each school site on interpreting and use of the *iReady* results
- Data Mining (Spring) – push in model at each school site based upon school and student goals.

Funding/Costs
- K-8 Assessment only - $285,660 (per student license based cost)
- K-8 Assessment and online Instructional Component –- $562,275 (based on per school cost)

Questions:
- Professional development plan – is there flexibility in the time that training is delivered? Could it also be offered this June? Yes, we have talked with the *iReady* representatives and they are flexible.
- The 213 pilot teachers have already been trained - will they need to be trained again? They would receive a different level of training.
- Has access to technology been addressed? Yes, they have already been talking with Technology about the needs for this purpose.
- A benefit of the assessment is that if the data lives at the district level, teachers can look at the historical data on their students right away at the beginning of the school year

Niki noted that *iReady* has already helped in several situations. Teacher testimonials:
- From a middle school librarian: The data helps influence what they buy for their libraries. Book Club selections – teachers bring *iReady* data and request selections based on that data
- They have also shared that information with other content area teachers to help them identify the needs of their students
- At Northshore MS, they have opened up the data from the pilot to the entire staff, not just the teachers who participated in the pilot. They have found the data very valuable in a variety of different ways.
- Based on the cost of including the instruction piece, is it beneficial enough to warrant the cost? Rachel: Yes, it has been very valuable. It's not random, or unneeded. As for high cap students, it is filling the gaps and deepening knowledge. One concern for high cap students is that as they are accelerated they have gaps, or move through so quickly they need review, and *iReady* provides the review they need. *iReady* has a portal filled with documents that can be shared with parents and teachers, and students too. "This is what you can do, here is what we should work on". It's great for students who need interventions, to provide the positives, plus the goals.
- The instructional piece is important. Just having the assessment without the instruction to provide the next steps is not as valuable. It doesn't replace instruction, it deepens it.
- How much technology proficiency do the young students (K, 1st, 2nd grade) need to use it? *iReady* is very simplified for the young students – can be used with iPads, track pad vs mouse, simplified logins, etc. There were several kindergarten and first grade teachers who participated in the pilot.

NSD Assessment Plan

Derek introduced the Northshore Assessment Plan, noting that the intention of the plan is not to test just for the sake of testing. We need to be cognizant of what we are testing for, otherwise we shouldn't be doing that test. The plan recommends three following categories of assessments:
- NSD Assessments
  - iReady – proposed as core screener and progress monitor

- o Individualized Running Record (IRR) – used for students who are identified as below grade level standard (*iReady* would identify those students). Used to diagnose accuracy, fluency and comprehension. Derek and Nikki illustrated how many students might need that level of assessment by showing data from *iReady*.
- Required State Assessments
- College Readiness Assessments

Obadiah clarified for the committee that the recommendation request is for three items:
- *iReady* as the required assessment for grades K-8 for reading and math and for optional high school interventions
- *iReady* instructional component as a supplemental for reading and math in grades K-8 and for high school interventions.
- NSD Assessment Plan for approval

Obadiah asked the committee members if they are ready to make a recommendation on one or all three of the components on the table, or to table a portion and reconvene in June. It was noted that CMAC has not had an opportunity to look closely at the assessment plan, as this evening was the first time the committee has seen it. The consensus of the committee was to table a decision on the NSD Assessment Plan until the meeting on June 3rd.

It was MOVED by Rebecca Nielsen to approve *iReady Assessment* as District Required Assessment for Reading and Math, Grades K-8 and for high school intervention purposes. Motion was SECONDED by Tiffany Rodriguez.

Again, this has a large technological impact. This is not a reason to hold up approval, but must be considered. One of the things that could be considered is that *iReady* could have a tiered rollout to match the tiered rollout of Technology. That would create an equity issue for schools not in the early rollout. Rebecca said we could include the acknowledgement that the technology must be present to use the assessment. Concern was expressed that the district will spend close to half a million dollars on materials that may not be used consistently. Obadiah mentioned that the budget is a separate issue, CMAC does not approve budget. We can recommend this for approval, but the budgetary decisions are made elsewhere in the organization.

Obadiah called for the question. The motion carried.

It was MOVED by Rebecca Nielsen to approve *iReady Instruction* as District Supplemental Curriculum for Reading and Math, Grades K-8 and for high school intervention purposes. Motion was SECONDED by Tiffany Rodriguez.

Obadiah called for the question. The motion carried.

CMAC will reconvene in June to discuss the assessment plan. Committee members should review the documentation provided tonight in preparation for that meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:59 PM.