

South Portland School Department
K-5 Reading Curriculum Selection Committee
Spring 2015

NOTES
3/31/15

Review in groups of the IPA evaluation rubrics

What are we looking for in a program? [√ indicate number of times it appeared]

- clear, proven scope and sequence that aligns to ELTs √
- builds higher order thinking skills (e.g., like what is required for responses on MEA) √
- includes vocabulary instruction √
- support whole group instruction, small group opportunities that builds foundational skills, phonics, phonological awareness, decoding strategies etc. √√√√
- either meshes well with WTW and BW or replaces it √√
- includes grammar instruction
- provides quality formative and summative assessment (e.g., includes objective measures of student achievement) √
- high interest literature (real literature not constructed, varying genres; text lengths, read alouds, anthologies, big books, mentor texts.)√√
- clear connections to CCSS √
- differentiates for ability and learning style, ELL, SPED √√√
- fosters creativity and helps students make connections
- child friendly
- openness for teacher creativity (and inclusion of other materials)√
- easy set-up for teachers and includes all materials needed for implementation (e.g., comes with leveled readers) √√

1. Are our criteria accounted for in the tool? (If not, what's missing?)

K: incorporate a lot; didn't include grammar, assessments, writing, teacher flexibility; special ed

1-2: incorporate a lot; didn't include grammar, assessments, writing, whether the work required of students was oral or written so need to have that as something to look for; extensions for upper end; need a way to be mindful of connections BTW or WTW (still need, how work together); connections to CCSS

3-6: incorporate a lot; didn't include grammar, assessments, writing, whether the work required of students was oral or written so need to have that as something to look for; extensions for upper end; need a way to be mindful of connections BTW or WTW (still need, how work together); connections to CCSS; fluency practice; model what see on standardized tests; teacher flexibility

2. Do the categories of the tool make sense? (If not, what parts are unclear?)

K: wouldn't cut anything out

1-2: categories ok; just needs additions; prior knowledge says go back to lessons already reviewed ... which ones is our question

3-6: not too overwhelming; fluency section could be beefed up; re-think how we go about the vocabulary section, could be cut down

3. What changes or adaptations may seem more beneficial?

K: same

South Portland School Department
K-5 Reading Curriculum Selection Committee
 Spring 2015

1-2: structure seems ok
 3-6: summary page is good

How to scale it back:

Kindergarten – some things are more mechanical while others could/should be divvied up
 Grade 1-2 – counting or scope/sequence could be done by one; where more subjective need to have more doing to have more data - if breaking things up make sure engaging with all parts of the program
 Grade 3-6 – dive up and review with a particular lens (e.g., needier students)

Reasons to discard/not consider (a.k.a. things to look for to bring to the table):

CCSS aligned
 Both evidenced-based and researched-based
 Needs to have an assessment component ... (how does program address BR)
 K-5 (if you find something that it is not K-5, bring it to the table knowing what is recommended to precede follow)
 Comprehensive (but know what that means regarding reproducibles/consumables)

Process Check/Next Steps

Introductory	Selection	Pilot (a.k.a. input)	Adoption	Implementation
√Committee creation	Reason for the change – RHB drafting	Define Input (pilot, survey, site visits)	Recommendation to K- 5 admin team - decision	
√Timeline & Process Overview	√Criteria development	Seek Input	Change Model to Board	
√Norm-setting	Materials research – everyone bring ideas to next meeting	Input debrief		
	Publisher’s showcases	Recommendation		
	Evaluations			
2/25/15 & 3/17/15	(3/17/15), 3/31/15; 4/28/15 & 5/19/15	(5/19 /15), 6/8/15 & 6/16/15		

Discuss Meeting times

April 28 – look at Change Model draft; review revised evaluation forms; share program ideas and decide what we want for showcases
 May 12 (**added**) - Publisher’s showcases / prep for board presentation
 May 19 - Publisher’s showcases/discuss-define Input
 June 8 – update to Board
 June 16 -