



Science Review Development Committee Meeting

Date: April 23, 2021

Time: 9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Meeting Purpose:	Develop a common vision and guiding principles for the review and revision of Kentucky Academic Standards in accordance with Kentucky Revised Statute (KRS) 158.6453
Meeting Called by:	Bridina Lemmer
Members:	<p>Present: APs: Freda Rigsby; Andy Sherlock; Stephanie Parrott; Shannon Wells; Gerald Brashear; Gina Crider; Sarah Barker; Mindy Crider; Denise Donahue; Jeanine Huss; Robbie Sergent; Kathleen Taft; Asheley Hoskins; Hallie Booth; Brittany Rutledge; Amanda Staggs; Robert Boram; Derek Stice; Steven Martell; Samantha Norris; Stephanie Harmon; Brandon Sumner; Emaleigh Osborn; Nancy Broyles; Catherina Sammons; Matthew Hayes; Carey Ruff; Dan Pascucci; Ashley Hoffman; Geoffrey Gearner</p> <p>RC: Samuel Northern; Emily Barber; Christina Morris; Brian Womack; Jamaal Stiles; Devin Cherry; Diane Fritz; Diane Johnson; Kim Yates; Les Pesterfield; Denny Potter; Megan Schargorodski</p> <p>KDE Staff: Thomas Clouse, Rae McEntyre, and Micki Ray</p> <p>AIR Staff: Bridina Lemmer, Tara Zuber, Donna Warthan, and Nathalia Trujillo</p> <p>Absent: APs: Benjamin Bowen, Amanda Ballman, Justin McFadden RC: none</p>

Time	Focus	Lead	Discussion
9:00 am	Welcome	Bridina Lemmer	Welcome, Zoom overview and conference recording notice
9:08 am	Meeting Called to Order	Bridina Lemmer	Member Introductions All present committee members shared their name, District/Organization, what they teach, and how they were feeling about the work.
9:52 am	Presentation of the Standards Review Process	Bridina Lemmer	Agreements, Norms and Virtual Meeting Logistics

			Review of virtual meeting logistics, shared agreements, and norms of collaboration. Public observer norms also were shared.
10:01am	Presentation of the Standards Review Process	Bridina Lemmer	<p>Review Timeline and Process Shared overview of KRS 158.6453, the standards review process.</p> <p>Purpose and Role Shared overview and purpose of the APs and the RC.</p>
10:06am	Presentation of the Standards Review Process	Bridina Lemmer	<p>History of Standards Review Historical context regarding the development and role of standards (both generally and specific to the current science standards) also were shared.</p>
10:20am	Develop a common vision for science education in Kentucky	Small group led	<p>Small Group Processing Committee members worked in small groups to discuss and answer questions related to equity in science education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How can we promote equity in science education?</i> • <i>How to build an equitable learning community in your science classroom?</i> • <i>How can this inform our work in reviewing and revising standards?</i>
11:00am	Develop a common vision for science education in Kentucky	Bridina Lemmer and participants	<p>Whole Group Processing Committee members shared one key takeaway and question discussed from their group discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 1: Important to provide or allow for flexibility in instruction as well as take into account local (community) context. • Group 2: How can equity be built into the standards while recognizing each communities' differences? • Group 3: How do we ensure that students of diverse backgrounds can equally gain understanding

			<p>what tools, supports and resources are available/needed to help teachers?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 4: Important to use phenomenon and standards-based experiences to help recapture lost interest in science in early years. • Group 5: Role of standards without standardizing (instruction) • Group 6: How do we keep current broad standards while keeping inquiry based learning that includes local culture and resources?
11:06am	Reminders and transition	Bridina Lemmer	<p>Individual Reflection</p> <p>Committee members individually reflected on the following questions and shared their thoughts via jamboard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does equity in science education look for you? • How will this inform the work moving forward?
11:10am	Break	11:10am	Break
11:23am	Develop a common vision for science education in Kentucky	Bridina Lemmer	<p>Identify Trends in Research and Practice-Process Introduction</p> <p>Committee members were introduced to a process designed to look at the national landscape and begin co-developing a group vision that is data-driven and grounded in equity.</p> <p>This process is a 5 step process that includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Individual data generation 2. Group data generation 3. Small groups craft claims 4. Agree on language 5. Vote on priorities <p>Committee members used the remaining meeting time to complete steps 1 and 2. Committee members were split into 6 groups. Each group was assigned research or other sources of data specific to science</p>

			standards and how students learn science. Members were asked to highlight key/important ideas and information and categorize them by vision, structure, equity and other. After their initial review, group members discussed and added findings to their assigned jamboard.
11:44am	Develop a common vision for science education in Kentucky	Small group led	Small Group-Identify Trends in Research and Practice Committee members joined their small groups to review materials and begin fact-finding review.
1:00 pm	Lunch break		
1:20pm	Develop a common vision for science education in Kentucky	Bridina Lemmer	Whole Group Check In Meeting facilitator checked in with the entire group and saw several needed more time. To accommodate, the schedule was adjusted to allow members to complete their work.
1:23pm	Develop a common vision for science education in Kentucky	Small group led	Small Group-Identify Trends in Research and Practice Small groups continued and completed their initial fact-finding in the materials they reviewed.
1:49pm	Develop a common vision for science education in Kentucky	Bridina Lemmer	Debrief and Day 1 Wrap Up Committee members met as a whole group to debrief the day by sharing one key take away and providing additional feedback to the facilitators. Overall, committee members appreciated the process and are looking forward to seeing the end of the process at the next meeting. Some clarification is needed on the timeline and difference between roles of the APs and RC. Committee members also requested meeting dates for the summer work and had process questions for the review itself.