

## K-12 Science Curriculum Resources Committee Meeting #3

**Date:** May 6, 2025

**Time:** 4:00 - 6:00 PM

**Location:** PVUSD District Office, District Training Center South Room, 15002 N. 32nd Street, Phoenix, AZ 85032

**Facilitator:** Robin Hayward (Secondary STEAM and Science Curriculum Specialist) and Krysta Perez (Elementary STEAM and Science Curriculum Specialist)

### Committee Members Present:

- **Administrator Representative** – Jean Koeppen, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum & Instruction
- **Community Member Representative** –
- **Teaching Staff Representative** – Alexandria Weiss, 7th/8th grades

Blake Rider, mentor teacher-math, science, CTE  
Debbie Arn, 4th grade-gifted  
Deborah Adams, gifted content replacement  
Devin Ellis, high school- physics and integrated science  
Djin Beauregard, 5th grade  
Donna Kirkpatrick, 3rd grade  
Gloria Perez, 1st grade-Spanish immersion  
Jenae Sidwell, 5th grade  
Katie Jenkins, 7th and 8th grade  
Kayla Vronoski, LAS 2nd-5th grades  
Lauren McHugh, 5th grade  
Mackenzie Dye, high school - honors and ap biology  
Melissa Sarnowski, kindergarten-ELD  
Misty Hoyt, 5th and 6th grade-CG  
Nanci Walker, ELD instructional coach  
Paulette Wilson, 8th grade  
Sarah Booth, 6th grade  
Suzanne Harris, 2nd grade

- **Principal Representative** – Ann Furnish, elementary principal  
Ashley Kilcullen, high school principal
- **Parent Representative** – Carol Culberson  
Benjamin Grover  
Mike Vargas

**Purpose:** To analyze key student performance data from various assessments and items from common assessments, and begin to establish a rubric for evaluating vendors, with the goal of narrowing the potential vendor list.

**Outcomes:**

- Investigate trends in data (ACT, common finals, AzSci)
- Review AzSci item specifications and performance level descriptors
- Analyze and discuss items from common assessments
- Review rubric examples then complete a rubric card sort
- Discuss weighting of rubric categories
- Review and discuss narrowing the vendor list

## Minutes

### I. Welcome

- A. Review Meeting Goals
- B. Review “game” of Science Standards terminology
- C. Review  $+\Delta$  from Meeting #2
  - Committee members appreciated the sensemaking activity during meeting 2 and having a chance to sit with different people at each meeting. They loved how the activity brought the thought process to life and enjoyed the podcasts.
- D. Homework share out
  - Committee members appreciated the homework emphasizing learning should build on prior knowledge, build deep understanding about fewer topics, and reinforcing instructional shifts toward modern teaching practices and students figuring things out

### II. Data Conversation

- A. Compare AzSci scores (5th, 8th, and 11th) grades in our district to other schools
- B. Explore the Data Dashboard
- C. Look at Common Finals data trends
- D. Look at trends in ACT scores
  - Comparisons were made from science scores to ELA scores
  - The question was brought up: “What science curriculum do other districts use?”
  - Observation was made: younger grades tend to score better on tests than older

- The comment was made that it is difficult to compare AzSci scores one year to the next because those are different students

### **III. 3D Assessments**

- A. Explore what performance level descriptors and AzSci Item Specifications are and what they indicate
- B. Look at various assessment items and discuss types of questions observed
  - Noted AzSci is a 3 dimensional science test
  - Noted that AzSci items include stimuli (tables, graphs, and charts) and discussed student preparation for analyzing data found within stimuli
  - The observation was made that DOK 1 questions are not the target of the test
  - In exploring performance level descriptors, it was noted that MP are the DOK 1 questions, while P and HP are DOK 3 and 4
  - Clarification on traditional tests versus scale score tests (like AzSci): for example, two students might have each got 13 questions correct, but they could have different scale scores depending on the DOK of the questions they got correct. Essentially, some questions are worth more points than others

### **IV. Rubrics**

- A. Review examples of rubrics
- B. Break into small groups to complete a rubric card sort
- C. Discuss weighting of rubric categories
  - 3 groups of 3 worked on the first half of the rubric card sort, while 3 groups of 3 worked on the second half
  - After organizing sections, groups put the first half together with the second half to analyze and discuss
  - Suggestions were made on sections to add as well as weighting of categories

### **V. Evaluate Potential Vendors**

- A. Review Current Vendor List
- B. Discuss narrowing vendors
  - Due to time, these sections were skipped this meeting
  - Explanation that RFPs were sent out and are due the day before our next meeting
  - Question brought up if the group can see parameters of the proposal—yes, the

group will see the letter and be able to compare to the proposals

**VI. Communication**

A. Communication

B. Meeting Evaluation

- + The rubric card sort activity was appreciated as it was engaging and provided opportunity to think through and talk about rubric categories and sections

**VII. Call to the Public and Questions**

A. Community Member Comments

- No community members present

**VIII. Next Steps**

A. Thank you for your service

B. Next Meeting - Thursday, May 15th from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm in the District Training Center South.

*Meeting was adjourned at 06:00 p.m.*

[Curriculum Adoption Meeting #3 - 5/6/25](#)

[Curriculum Adoption Meeting #2 - 4/22/25](#)

[Curriculum Adoption Meeting #1 - 4/15/25](#)