



Standards Review and Revision
Committee Meeting
Science

May 19-20, 2017

Face-to-Face Meeting Notes

Committee Co-Chairs: John Eyolfson and Charlie Warren

Committee Members present: Amy Hanson, Angie Outlaw, Bev DeVore-Wedding, Bill Penuel, Catherine Kolbet, Cheryl Mosier, Dorothy Shapand, Jessica Noffsinger, Kathy Nall, Kevin Lindauer, Laura Sprice, Matt Zehner, Scott Graham, Shannon Wachowski, Sherri Dennstedt, Stephanie Spiris, Steve Iona, and Tabbi Kinon.

Day One: May 19, 2017

AM Focus: The science committee discussed the overall purpose and context of the standards review and revision work, such as processes, timelines, and guidelines, and began to share their individual reviews of the science standards, the benchmarking report, and their review of public feedback and comments. The committee:

- Shared goals, member roles, processes, and agreements for working together, and
- Worked in grade-band groups (PreK-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12) to share and develop understandings of committee members' findings.

PM Focus: Science committee members shared their individual reviews of the science standards, the benchmarking report, and their review of public feedback and comments with the larger groups to look for trends or themes across all documents. The committee:

- Shared findings in a whole group setting, with much of the discussion focused on where to begin the work of revision, and
- Turned comments and feedback into actionable statements for further consideration on Day Two.

Day Two: May 20, 2017

AM Focus: The science committee revisited the charge presented to them on day one, specifically the ideas of the revision being *research-based*, and *nationally and internationally benchmarked*, and shared their views on where to begin the revision process. The committee:

- Worked individually, in small groups, and in the large group to discuss where and how



to begin their work.

PM Focus: The science committee continued the work from the morning and discussed recommendations on how the standards template should look with regards to science-specific aspects. The committee:

- Came to consensus on how they wish to move the revision process forward, which includes, amongst others, using the *K12 Science Framework* to guide their decision making processes, learning progressions/vertical alignment should be rooted in the research, and connecting to student interest and relevance need to guide their approach to revision, and
- Came to consensus on recommendations for the Science standards template.

June Meeting Next Steps

For the next meeting of the science committee on June 16, committee members will:

- Use the benchmark report and other feedback to evaluate Prepared Graduate Competencies and Core ideas, Grade Level Expectations and Disciplinary Core Ideas, and Evidence Outcomes and performance expectations, with the intent to check for alignment, and
- Draft sample documents that show how structural issues and organization of the science standards (such as organization of Evidence Outcomes under the Grade Level Expectations) might be addressed with a focus on improved usability and learning progressions.