



K-12 SCIENCE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS REVIEW COMMITTEE

February 29, 2024 – Professional Support Center

Elementary School (2051) 8:30am - 10:30am

Middle School (2051) 1:00pm - 3:00pm

High School (2054) 8:30am - 10:30am

	Topic Discussion	Notes and Action Items
1.	Review Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting opened by Amber Platowski @8:34
2.	Review Minutes from 11/7/23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2/22/23 Notes Reviewed • Any Changes or Additions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No changes at this time
3.	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Public comment.
4.	Evaluation Results Review 4-Thoroughly 3-Good 2-Poor 1-Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Went Over Results ○ Discussed- What are your noticings from these graphs? ○ Discussed- What do you wonder after viewing these results? • Biology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Why is McGraw so much better? ○ National Geo is not much better than what we have now. ○ STEMscopes- needs a physical book. ○ SAVVAS- Liked their EOC question, could use more graphics and more graphs. ○ McGraw Hill had lot of pictures and diagrams but did not provide the EOC questions. ○ Savvas touches the standards but just needs more. ○ What were your thoughts about ELL support? McGraw the wording is a lower level and has more graphs and charts, Savvas did not have that. ○ Savvas was missing standards- no lesson on graphs and charts. Does not go into depth. ○ McGraw Hill has a big section on graphs and charts. Every section has a human impact. Amazing with diagrams and breaking them down. ○ Recommendation to move McGraw Hill and Savvas.

- STEMscopes- connectivity, is more current information.
- STEMscopes- all mapped for new teachers.
- You can also download the pdfs on STEMscopes and print them out so as a teacher you will have a physical copy option.

- **Motion to move McGraw Hill forward as a finalist**

- **20- yes**
- **1 – no**
- Comprehension checks- Savvas was good with that.
- If you give a student a computer, they are playing games and not working.
- When does the state list for the approved publishers come out? We will not adopt anything not on the approved list.
- Nat Geo has that real world connection, but it does no good if they don't have the EOC connection.
- STEMscopes- no index, up to the kid to find it themselves.
- EOC is very critical.

- **Move forward with all 3 Nat Geo, Savvas, and McGraw Hill**

- **17- Yes**
- **4- No**

- **Environmental-**

- Savvas- like that they had a lot of visuals, all translates in google translation,
- McGraw Hill- very impressed with online features but not really with the book no visuals. The population sections were inappropriate in some areas.
- Nat Geo- most updated but did not have the online features. The online tool wasn't easy to use.
- Savvas- online was easier to use.
- Savvas is a lower level which help with our ESE Students. Very user friendly. The text being accessible to all students.
- The Savvas book had remediation components online that were pretty easy to use. If we use it, the textbook is really accessible to all students. It looked thorough from an outside perspective.
- Page in the McGraw Hill book about populations that included photographs of a condom. Teachers and community members were very concerned about that content being included.

- **Motion to move forward with Savva-**

- **21- Yes**
- **0 – No**

- Nat Geo- is more up to date.
- McGraw Hill wording was lacking and the textbook would be overwhelming.

- **Motion to move forward with Nat Geo-**

- **20- Yes**
- **1 – No**

- **Marine Science-**

- **There is 2 moves both forward-**

- **21 -Yes**
- **0- NO**

- McGraw Hill covered more.
- McGraw Hill is very small, very superficial.
- Nat Geo- is more up to date.
- Both books are equal, teachers will have to find other materials.
- NatGeo had a lot more online functions which can be more adaptable to the ELLs and ESE especially with Schoology setup.
- Nat Geo had a lot more online materials that would be helpful for teachers.
- Nat Geo gave us a printed lab manual, is that included adopted material.

- **Physics-**

- STEMscopes- Did not provided a physical book,
- Savvas- unique way to present the materials.

-

- **Moving Forward with Savvas and McGraw Hill**

- **21- Yes**
- **0- No**

- **Chemistry-**

- STEMscopes- were not rigor enough for the students.
- STEMscopes- Blank on every other page. It was not complete.
- STEMscopes did not prepare students for honors classes if that was the path they wanted to take.
- Savvas book related chemistry to real world relevance. It was divided up into subjects that would be of high interest. But it would make the students focus more on the phenomenon and not the actual chemistry.
- McGraw and Savvas are only online. There is no way to self-check to see if they are doing the problems correctly.
- Nat Geo- it is a math graph, has those math questions and can look in the back of the book to see if they are doing it correctly.
- Savvas does not have that math support that Nat Geo has.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ McGraw and Nat Geo went more in order. ○ Nat Geo- does have the supports for the ELL kids. ○ More consumables with Nat Geo and McGraw Hill. ○ Nat Geo- is friendly for new teachers- gives you more information ● Move forward with McGraw Hill and Nat Geo <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 – Yes ▪ 0- No ● Anatomy and Physiology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Savvas was just columns and reading level was a little higher. ○ Very few diagrams and pictures in the Savvas books. ○ Nat Geo online was better than McGraw Hill ○ They are very similar. There are videos, critical thinking, as well as clinical applications. While Savvas had similar aspects it was geared more towards a higher level. A teacher really liked McGraw Hill. The chapter opens with themes that will help lower-level readers. ○ McGraw Hill online was okay, but the textbook was better. ○ McGraw Hill- chapters open with themes- and went more into detail and always referred to them throughout the chapters. Diagrams were real life images. ○ Nat Geo was about the same but did not have a lot of diagrams. ● Move forward Nat Geo and McGraw Hill- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21-Yes ▪ 0-No
5.	Finalist Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Finalist <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Biology- McGraw Hill, Nat Geo, and Savvas ○ Environmental- Savvas, and Nat Geo ○ Marine Science- McGraw Hill, and Nat Geo ○ Chemistry- Nat Geo and McGraw Hill ○ Physics- Savvas and McGraw Hill ○ Anatomy and Physiology – McGraw Hill and Nat Geo
6.	Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Notify publishers March 1st , 2024 ● Information will be shared with schools March 11-22, 2024. ● All employees will have online access to review materials. ● Print materials are available at PSC for review.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All instructional staff can submit their choices to an online survey. Principals are required to submit their vote via an online survey.
7.	Closing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next Meeting- Tuesday, April 2, 2024<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Professional Support Center○ 8:30am -10:30am• During the next meeting<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Review SDMC staff votes○ Determine Final Recommendation