

NC Textbook Commission Subcommittee on Digital Resources

Virtual Meeting Minutes

July 2, 2020
10 a.m. – 11 a.m.

Call to order: Commissioner Linker called the Textbook Sub-Committee meeting to order.

Roll call: Dr. Fair did the roll call.

Members present: Angela Flowers, Hannah Jimenez, Kathleen Linker and Lindsey Sise
Members absent: William Chesher

Approval of minutes: Commissioner Linker announced that the approval of the June 11 meeting minutes will be deferred to the next subcommittee meeting.

Canvas Course Creation: Commissioner Linker had everyone to go to the advisor's Canvas course. She explained that she made the changes that were discussed at the last meeting and that she collapsed all the smaller courses into one. She removed the restrictions to enable everyone to view without having problems. The welcome is the same, she changed the quiz and asked for any input on the changes. Commissioner Linker made it a multiple-choice question and tried to phrase the second question to be whatever their (advisors) answer was in the first question they are signing their name to verify their answer on the media release form. That gave them the option to not give permission for their picture to be shown. Before they only had the one to give permission and then they put their picture on. Commissioner Linker mentioned she will go back and change the directions to say if you don't want your picture then don't put it up. Commissioner Jimenez wanted clarification. For the first question they have to choose the answer choice and for the second one they type in their full name and what we (commissioners) will do is go back and see which of the answers they chose so we know. Commissioner Linker said that was correct. It is not graded so this is a way of them choosing it.

The next section, "What is an advisor" stayed the same. Commissioner Linker put the flyer at the beginning, initially it was later on in a different module. We (subcommittee members) will need to go in and fix it and replace it. She has the standards written down she just hasn't gone and added to them. She placed it at the beginning because after thinking about it she realized they've (the advisors) already seen this slide. At this point, they've already filled out the application and applied to be considered and they are in that big database of potential candidates by the time we get to this point. They have to be chosen to be an advisor to get to this point to the point of this course. So, this is just a reminder but it's not important because they've already passed the point where they need to see this flyer. Commissioners asked if there were any recommendations or

changes. The next two slides are the same. She changed the “representation qualification task” and she used an actual photograph from last year from by Commissioner Jimenez from the high school room. Everyone supplied the media release the last time so we can put that picture in it. Commissioner Linker re-worded the “representation qualification task” because it sounded really formal, she wanted it to sound as if they were in the meeting before they evaluate and talking to them about the work, that feel, and not official and very technical. Commissioner Sise said she really liked that slide. Commissioner Linker said she wanted them to know that they are qualified applicants and they represent the 8 regions across the state and what their (the advisors) task was. She left the advisor acknowledgement but that is up to the State. The last time they (subcommittee members) talked about this, that there were 4 things that they needed to do in the advisors’ packet and reviewing the State Board Policy TEXT-2002 (TEXT-002) is one of the four things. Commissioner Linker kept it there with the hyperlink and the advisor 2 slide is also hyperlinked. If we (subcommittee members) decide they don’t need this, we are playing around with the idea of possibly putting something in at the end of the next module that says “I’m acknowledging that I have looked at SBE Policy TEXT-202 (TEXT-002)” reviewed the Invitation and the textbook adoption process website and make it one thing that they sign off. So that could possibly be one hits all four of the requirements, but she just left it for now.

Commissioner Linker left the feedback specifically for the advisor like if they have any questions. The next one, that’s what changed. So what we put was kept the commission separate from the Invitation and all that. It’s one module called “What I need to know before Evaluation Week” and the slides are the same and in the same order. They are all in one module together instead of being in four little modules. Again, you will see a sign off for the Invitation that can come out. Other than correcting the slide that took up the full page nothing else changed. That module is the same.

The standards review acknowledgement is where subcommittee members would include acknowledgement that advisors have read all four required things, if not individually. She didn’t want advisors to feel like it was a lot of tedious stuff to wade through. For the last couple of modules, in the Math 9-12 resources she put a page that has a link to the standards. They are in two different places, Math 1, 2 and 3 is one place, Math 4, Discrete Math and Pre-Calculus are in another place and the CTE is also a link to the big resource with all the standards. One of their goals was for it to be a resource for them to go to.

Commissioner Linker did change the goals for the course. She made it more of a listing and added the part about evaluation week. The first two and the last were the same as before but the third one is new which is the goal about the overview of evaluation week, which is the one that was just created. That’s all changes. After the meeting, members will go into their individual time to work. The next part which is evaluation week. Commissioner Linker sent a link out with some notes for everybody to contribute and collaborate separately to let them know what that

week looks like. From those notes she made pages (blank) to hold the process and the debrief. Suggestions and bullets will be added at the next phase.

For this the subcommittee members will all work together on “What I need to know for Evaluation Week” and individually, members can work on it by collaborating on the Google Doc. The goal with that is to have it on a page and to come together to decide what to have on the page in the course. Commissioner Linker said they had not received any more input from the advisors. Some peer reviews are still out. The correction was made there was no additional feedback for the course for commissioners. It was noted that one commission member is going to look at it in its final view after it is in its final stage.

The subcommittee needs to pick a date to meet to discuss what it should look like for “evaluation week”. It has been divided showing what the room looks like, the materials, the work and stopped at the debriefing. It should not be overwhelming but should be a good resource if there are questions. Information will be on pages with appropriate titles.

Commissioner Sise commented on the use of bullet points versus the use of multiple pages. The use of pictures to create a video was discussed as it was noticed there is no media in the course. This would offer a break from reading. There may be a few pictures. That can be available for subcommittee members to view. It was mentioned that the pictures don’t necessarily have to be pictures of people but of the room because of the amount of information to convey. Maybe a video would be a better way to convey the information. By the time they get to this module, they will be tired of reading and will need a switch in how they are receiving that information. Commissioner Sise mentioned leaving the video up in the background while talking about things that will go on in the room. Commissioner Jimenez and Commissioner Sise agreed to work on the video together. Subcommittee members will work on the document collaboratively on their own time and come up with things that are important. Commissioners Sise and Jimenez will pick a date to work together to make a video or this can be done as a group. Commissioner Jimenez suggested they schedule a time to make a first draft of the video and when they come back together, they can see if anyone has any suggestions or changes they want to make.

Commissioner Linker asked for timeline to finish the brainstorming. She suggested subcommittee members could contribute ideas by Monday. The group discussed scheduling challenges and possible dates for the next meeting. An afternoon time was discussed by the group. The subcommittee will be polled for the next meeting date and time.

Next Steps/Timeline: Commissioner Linker will reach out others for any pictures that they might have. The suggestion was made to consider having previous successors provide a blurb or snippet on the video about the process. The course has a lot content so maybe a little humor and interesting touches can be added. The module should be professional, interesting and engaging. Subcommittee members are considering sending a mass email to previous advisors. Subcommittee members can create a message to send. They will come up with a question or

prompt so that they all get the same information. The subcommittee discussed how this part could be created. They agreed to brainstorm ideas and Commissioner Flowers agreed to be responsible for the final message. Next Tuesday is the suggested deadline for that idea. A recap of the timeline.

“Evaluation notes” (for module) finished by the 6th, message for former advisors to provide snippets due by the 6th, and video for “evaluation week” due on the 14th depending on the date for the next meeting. The subcommittee members will have a folder for pictures. Members will put ideas in a document for brainstorming.

Meeting Adjourned: Commissioner Linker asked for someone to make a motion for the meeting to be adjourned. Commissioner Sise motioned for the meeting to be adjourned and Commissioner Jimenez second the motion. All members in attendance agreed for the meeting to be adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 10:39 a.m.

Minutes taken by: Audrey Long, NCDPI

Minutes approved: July 22, 2020