

## Iowa Core Science Standards Review Team

March 24, 2015 9:00 a.m. -- 4:00 p.m.

Science Center of Iowa  
401 W. Martin Luther King Jr. Parkway  
Des Moines, Iowa

### Meeting Notes

*Notes submitted by Susan Peterson*

#### **Attendees:**

*Science Team Members: John Bedward, Lyn Countryman, Renee Harmon, Kris Kilibarda, Rob Kleinow, Chris Kurtt, Dean Lange, Jon Markus, Jim Pifer, Abby Richenberger, Courtney Van Wyk*

*Facilitators: Marian Godwin, Susan Peterson*

*DE Staff Observers: Brad Niebling, Staci Hupp, Yvette McCulley, Rita Martens*

*Public Observers: One visitor, plus a Zoom meeting with Cedar Rapids press*

#### **Notes:**

The meeting convened at 9:12 a.m.

#### **Agenda Item: Introduction and welcome**

Brad Niebling welcomed and thanked the group for their work, reviewing their purpose and charge. Brad spoke of the group looking through the public feedback data at the previous meeting, asking the Science Team to reflect upon how that data will affect the decisions put before them. He reminded the group that their first order of business would be to decide if the Next Generation Science Standards would be the starting point and baseline for the Science Team's work. The Science Team was again reminded that if they needed additional resources at any point in time, those resources would be provided.

Marian Godwin reviewed the day's agenda and meeting norms.

#### **Agenda Item: Review of March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Meeting**

The March 5<sup>th</sup> meeting was reviewed, and the Science Team was reminded that the specific themes, which were identified as emerging from the public input, were shared in both emails to the team and in the Science Team's shared Google Docs folder.

**Agenda Item: Decide whether the NGSS will be used as a baseline for the Science Team's work**

Copies of Executive Order 83 were provided to the team members and the order was read out loud as a reminder of the Science Team's charge for making a recommendation for Iowa's Science Standards. The team agreed they were ready to decide if the NGSS would be the starting point for their work. With ten members present at that point and another who would be arriving late, the group discussed what should be considered a quorum. The team identified sixteen members who they considered active participants, and with this in mind, they came to an agreement that having nine members present, a majority of those active people, would constitute a quorum.

A proposal was submitted for ranking. The Proposal Rating Sheet is shown below:

*Proposal: The Next Generation Science Standards should be the starting point to develop a document to be submitted as the recommendation for the State of Iowa K-12 Science Standards. Nine members were in strong agreement or agreement with this proposal, with one member in disagreement.*

<p>The Next Generation Science Standards should be the starting point to develop a document to be submitted as the recommendation for the State of Iowa K-12 Science Standards</p>					<p>Signatures</p>
<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p>					<p><i>Fill your one dot below &amp; sign on the right:</i></p>
<p><b>Strong Agreement</b></p>	<p><b>Agreement</b></p>	<p><b>Neutral</b></p>	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p>	<p><b>Strong Disagreement</b></p>	<p><b>?</b> <i>Confusion</i></p>
<p>●●●●●●●●○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p>●○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p>○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p>●○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p>○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p>○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>
<p><b>Strengths &amp; Opportunities</b></p>			<p><b>Concerns &amp; Weaknesses</b></p>		
<p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>			<p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>		
<p>Sheet #: _____</p>			<p>Date: 24 March 2015 Organization/Event: Science Standards Review Team</p>		

The group was given the opportunity to have a discussion which could possibly lead to a modification of the proposal which might lead to consensus. All team members agreed a further discussion was not necessary, and the group concurred to move forward with the acceptance of the NGSS as their starting point.

**Agenda Item: Large group review of Issues for Discussion which were generated at the last meeting**

The Science Team recognized the need to define “Standard” when referring to the NGSS. The large group discussed this at length, making references to the authors’ intent, public feedback data, and professional experience with the NGSS. The team then had further discussions in their Content Area Groups, and two proposals were written for the large group to consider. **Note: These proposals are with regard to the Next Generation Science Standards as a starting point for a recommendation yet to be made.** The Proposal Rating Sheets are shown below:





*Proposal: The Iowa Core Science Standards are the NGSS Performance Expectations which are constructed from the three foundation boxes. Ten members were in strong agreement or agreement with this, and one member was in disagreement.*

<p><i>The Iowa core science standards are the NGSS Performance Expectations which are constructed from the three foundation boxes.</i></p>					<p><b>Signatures</b></p>
<p><b>Do you agree?</b> <small>Fill your one dot below &amp; sign on the right:</small></p>					
<p><b>Strong Agreement</b></p> <p>●●●●●●●●●● ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p><b>Agreement</b></p> <p>●○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p><b>Neutral</b></p> <p>○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p> <p>●○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p><b>Strong Disagreement</b></p> <p>○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p><b>Confusion</b></p> <p>○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○</p>
<p><b>Strengths &amp; Opportunities</b></p> <p>.....</p>			<p><b>Concerns &amp; Weaknesses</b></p> <p>.....</p>		
<p>Sheet #: _____</p>		<p>Date: 24 March 2015</p>		<p>Organization/Event: Science Standards Review Team</p>	

The team agreed they would consider standards to be the performance expectations which are constructed from the three foundation boxes, as they move forward with their work. The team members continued reviewing the themes that emerged from their analysis of the public feedback data.

**Agenda Item: Content Area Teams begin work on data sheets addressing various topics with regard to their disciplines.**

The Science Team broke into their Content Area Groups to address those topics which they had identified as needing more discussion based upon the public feedback data. The groups then reconvened as a large group, and their discussion centered upon whether the middle school standards should be grouped together or individually by grades 6, 7 and 8. The following question was put before the large group to consider. The sheet is shown below:



*Proposal: Middle schools should adopt an integrated sequence with specific Performance Expectations located in grades 6, 7, and 8 as per the conceptual progressions pathway in appendix K of the NGSS. Ten members were in strong agreement or agreement with this, and one member was in disagreement.*

<p>Middle schools should adopt an integrated sequence with specific PE's located in grades 6, 7, and 8 as per the conceptual <sup>progressions</sup> pathway in appendix K of NGSS.</p>					<p>Signatures</p>
<p><b>Do you agree?</b></p>					<p><i>Fill your one dot below &amp; sign on the right:</i></p>
<p><b>Strong Agreement</b></p>	<p><b>Agreement</b></p>	<p><b>Neutral</b></p>	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p>	<p><b>Strong Disagreement</b></p>	<p><b>?</b> <b>Confusion</b></p>
<p>●●●○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p>●●●●●○○○ ○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p>○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p>●○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p>○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○</p>	<p>○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○</p>
<p><b>Strengths &amp; Opportunities</b></p>			<p><b>Concerns &amp; Weaknesses</b></p>		
<p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>			<p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>		
<p>Sheet #: _____</p>			<p>Date: 24 March 2015 Organization/Event: Science Standards Review Team</p>		

**Agenda Item: Standards Review Team plans schedule and next steps**

The Science Review Team will meet again on April 14, and at that time the group will go over the Next Generation Science Standards in detail and consider any further adaptations based on public feedback.

**Agenda Item: Meeting Adjourns**

The meeting was officially adjourned at 3:40 p.m.