



**State Council for Educator Effectiveness
2nd Read Protocol**

Name:

2nd Read Topic (e.g., NC/CO cross-walked teacher standards):

What changes would you want to make in this proposed language to make you feel comfortable with it?

Additions (note here language or ideas that you feel strongly need to be added for this to draft to gain your support)	Omissions (note here any language or ideas that you feel strongly need to be omitted from this draft in order for it to gain your support)	Revisions (note here language or ideas that needs revision in order for this draft to gain your support).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Δ Standard 1a says in red incorporates literacy and numeracy across all content standards – perhaps add “where appropriate” (SS) • Δ Standard 1d lists 21st century skills. I think we should replace their list of skills with the list that CO is using so the language aligns with the CO standards (SS) • Δ Standard II d – sped. It must say something about implementing the student’s IEP or any other legal requirements for delivery of instruction. (SS) • Δ Standard III h – after evaluate student’s academic growth also add “adapt their instruction” (SS) • Δ Standard V b – Last sentence about participating in hiring, mentoring, and supporting teachers should say “where appropriate” . Not all teachers help hire all the time, and not all teachers are asked or should mentor others. (SS) • Δ Standard V e – this is the only place that talks about teacher adult behavior 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Δ Not sure teachers can “provide an environment in which each child has a positive, <u>nurturing relationship with caring adults</u>” unless that environment is limited to the classroom or other areas which the teacher can influence and “control.” Educator should be able to provide a respectful, supportive learning environment in the classroom. (MS) • Don’t like the “inconclusive” category. This suggests that a proper evaluation process was not performed or that the evaluation was not adequately tailored to a unique situation. Seems like it would be a loop hole in the process. (MS) Have left this in for now with the assumption that there may need to be such a placeholder but then a good set of guidance about when it is OK to use it, and how, if at all, indicating that something is inconclusive will implicate the teacher’s overall rating in this 50%. We should revisit this at the retreat to see if people want to remove it since this was not discussed at the last meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Δ Words such as know, align, understand, recognize, embrace, analyze, reflect, etc do not drive home the need for the standards to be observable, demonstrable and measurable. “teachers demonstrate knowledge of the content...” is more powerful and indicative of the intent of the performance standard. All teachers are “able” to assist students in the development of critical thinking, is much less powerful than all teachers “demonstrate the ability to effectively” assist... or “provides observable evidence of... etc (MS) Have changed language quite a bit. There are places where the standards language is less demonstrable (i.e. IV) but the elements language is demonstrable and it did not work well to change the standards language to be more specific. • In many cases the language does more directly support observable, demonstrable and measurable actions; e.g. develop and apply strategies, provide a balanced curriculum, adapt teaching to special needs, plan

with other adults, which is the cause of many problems that administrators have with teachers. A teacher may be great with students and extremely disruptive on a staff. This language is not strong enough to cover that instance. (SS) **Now Vb and Vc also contain relevant language**

- **Δ Standard III g** – grammar, spelling and writing needs to be included (MC)
- **Δ Standard III b** – add “by asking students for feedback” (SP)

- **Appears to be on the order of 28 measurements in this system, many of which have similar, overlapping or even redundant content, features or characteristics. May want to do some combining and simplifying to enable more effective and focused understanding of each standard, how it will be measured and how the observations, evaluation process, etc will be prepared, trained, evidence collected and evaluated, etc. (MS)**
Appreciate this comment and felt that we discussed the particular challenges of the NC standards at the last meeting. Collapsing and moving too much more feels like it would be counterproductive at this point but again this may need to be raised to the whole group if we want to move in this direction.
- **Δ Where does it capture the positive interaction between students? (TD)**
Now IIa and IIb
- **Δ Standard I b** – Don’t need “elementary teachers have a broad knowledge”. It’s already there (BS)
- **Δ Standard Ib** – remove last two sentences (TD)

instruction, work collaboratively, etc (MS)

- **Δ I think we want educators to enable students to see the interrelationships between content areas or disciplines rather than “connect the learning for students.” (MS)**
- **Δ Standard II b** – This language is not current in my opinion. It stresses understanding cultures and recognizing differences, but does not really get at equity and access issues, which is where current thought has progressed. (SS)
- **Δ Standard IIe** –this wording of “cultural and economic obstacles” needs rewording. A child’s culture or economic situation should not be viewed as an obstacle. I get the idea here, but find the wording offensive (SS)
- **Δ Standard IIIb** – wording “by making the curriculum responsive to cultural differences and individual learning needs” maybe say responsive and accessible to children of different cultures or with individual learning needs. (SS)
- **Δ Standard V a** – seems big and a little repetitive. (Take it out and compare to our definition. Make sure every element appears) (TD) **Have mapped each part of the element and indicated in the revised version where each now appears. We could now take this element out. I am using the language from here as the basis for a draft definition of teacher effectiveness.**
- **Δ Change “child” to “student; “Colorado Academic Standards” (NL)**
- **Δ Maximum student focus on learning...vague. We should decide**

what we mean by that. (NL)

- **Δ** We use the PWR standard throughout; there are other places we talk about 21st century skills and other components of the PWR standard. IT seems like we're undermining the notion of PWR, which is the state standard.(NL) You could just clarify this once in the document (LS). **Have changed to PWR language where it makes sense.**
- **Δ** Pg 3, 2b – Identity matters more than culture, feels more inclusive (NL). Could do identity and culture (KD)
- **Δ** Where we say “gaps in achievement”, would like to say “gaps in achievement and growth” (NL)
- 3b and 5d – the way student engagement is discussed feels more passive than engaging students as active partners in climate, culture and academic growth (NL)
- **Δ** More active language around student engagement, student ownership, student leadership (TD) **IIIf, Vd**
- Standard 6 – Feels like trying to translate an outcome into a standard. Would rather embed in other standards. (MS) – **discussed at meeting and group agreement seemed to be to leave standard VI intact for now.**