

**State Council for Educator Effectiveness
Teacher Standards Assignment
October 1, 2010 Meeting**

Please take 30-40 minutes to complete the following assignment in preparation for our Teacher Standards session at the Friday Council meeting. Please print out your responses and bring them to the meeting.

1. Please review the "Matrix Activity Outcomes Sept 17" developed at the last meeting, as well as the attached "Teacher Stnds Group Outcomes" which presents the matrix outcomes in a slightly different format. Finally, please review the attached "SCEE Teacher Quality Standards 9 24 10". These standards were drafted by members of the working group on teacher standards based on the small group work done at the last meeting.

Please note that several big issues (such as student voice, parental involvement, use of technology, and special needs students) which were flagged by only one working group as worthy of being separate standards have been subsumed under broader categories in these draft standards. This is not an indication that the issues are not highly important; rather, it reflects a desire to keep to a reasonable number of standards which themselves encompass sets of interrelated values/issues which are big enough to break out into sub-categories of measurable performance standards.

2. Please ask yourself the following questions and fill in your responses below:
 - a. Please read through the 9 draft SCEE Teacher Quality Standards and indicate for each standard whether you feel comfortable including this standard as one of the Council's recommended teacher standards. Please focus more on the big ideas denoted by each standard rather than worrying overmuch about what the details will be. Note that there will be an opportunity during the meeting to discuss specific categories to be included under each major standard which will help to flesh out many specific topics that have come up during past meetings. If you do not support the inclusion of a particular standard please note your reasons and be prepared to share them with the Council at the meeting. Please also note any major wording changes you would like to suggest. You may also wish to note potential sub-categories of issues to be included under each standard.
 - b. Once you have considered all 9 of the draft teacher standards from the TAG working group, identify any additional standards which you think ought to be added or broken out. Again, please make notes to share these during the meeting.

Your responses will inform our discussion on October 1.

RESPONSES:

A. Please indicate below whether you support the inclusion of this standard and note any comments:

Standard	Agree/Disagree and comments or major wording changes
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INTASC wording captured it better: “creates learning experiences...”, rather than “ensuring mastery”. The way that INTASC raises it is much more measurable. Ensuring access and meaningful experiences • Tools for inquiry is an instructional strategy, so it stood out. (clarification: this particular wording isn’t necessarily magical; the idea was to get past the idea that content is facts.”) A teacher should be able to pick these up and be very clear about meaning. You don’t want someone to interpret that in a way we didn’t mean for it to be. We need to work on the phrasing of this. It needs to be more than just content...what does content include? It may become clear as we break out the standard. Maybe there’s a framing piece. • Several of these looked like sub-standards, not sure why they’re in the actual standards. Should be fleshed out below. • The wording doesn’t clearly delineate between skill development for the teacher or student. If we’re talking skill development for the student, is mastery really on the teacher side vs. the student side? It would be a great goal to have on the student side, but may not be attainable. • Critical elements of how we assess each need to be delineated in the sub-bullets. • Not clear who has to have mastery. Students need to demonstrate mastery as well. Need to clarify that language. • Deals with the static content of what you’re teaching, not how you’re teaching. The “how” comes later in instructional strategies. When we talk about mastery of content, there was an assumption (on my part) that we’re talking about students. We can put the word “student” in between “ensure” and “mastery”. • General clarification – the expectation is that these would be weighted heavily
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student is more appropriate wording. Not children. • Missing – teacher understands how students learn, but should also engage their students in the learning. This is mentioned in the 3rd standard. Perhaps the two could be connected. Maybe the title could be “learner engagement and Learner Development”. Could change wording to “implement developmentally appropriate, engaging and challenging learning experiences”. Actively engaging students. • How do you engage students and instructional strategies is in Standard 5. Should this be included in this standard instead? In Standard 2 we’re talking about engaging learners. The engagement piece is an indicator. • Include language about gifted learners. • It doesn’t appear to explicitly focus on present perfect tense of learner development. One of the critical elements of our vision is that we’re developing lifelong learners, not just learners present in the classroom. Critical part is that you’re developing learning capability that is lifelong. Could we perhaps elaborate on that in Standard 7? IT seems to be a logical extension there, because it’s a characteristic you’re developing. IT’s not called out enough in the phrasing in the standard, but could be a bullet in the standard. Could also be added to standard 9.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that we don't refer to individual learning. It can't always be collaborative. INTASC does this. • We never capture the classroom management part of it in the wording. Environment that is safe, orderly. Collaboration could be positive or could be distracting. Last week, only one group had classroom management in the matrix. Some assume that this is a precondition to being an educator. • Suggestion to elevate Classroom Management to a specific standard. We don't spend enough time dealing with classroom management. Teachers in the field aren't given enough support in the field in terms of skill level. We do want to avoid the two extremes "just good content, classroom management will take care of itself" vs. "separate the rules from participation in learning". The way that classroom teams are established to support learning and ensure orderly participation by everyone. IT is true that it becomes a nonissue. Classroom management includes time, materials, space, how you arrange your students; it's not just rules. This will be really important on the sub-standards. It's also the management side. We can hit some of these in the sub-standards. • It's a learning environment based upon student needs, lessons, etc. So teachers need to have facility in all diff types of learning environments (collaborative and individual) • There's an equity and acces issue around the learning environment. Does the learning environment engage all students or just some? Can all students relate to the activity. It's about making your environment one that everyone can access. Maybe we can fit it in Standard 5 or Standard 4.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We could be more clear on wording when we say "community". Are we talking about the outside community, or the classroom as a community? It's not clear here. There are different kinds of communities and we need to define that. It seemed like we were getting at the planning and whether the teacher is maximizing the time in the classroom. It seems like Standard 7 covers tha outside the community. This is more about using the resources available to maximize the time in the classroom. This is more about the equity pedagogy. When we get to a final product, we shouldn't be in discussions about interpretation. It needs to be very clear so it's being implemented in the way we intended. • This is 3 contending big standards: knowledge of standards (broken out from content), planning for instruction, individualizing instruction. Current standards for CO teachers separates Individualizing Instruction as a separate standard. It's useful to be explicit about what's being captured here. "Community" hasn't been hammered out. Suggestion to change "community" to "families". • What elevates this to a separate standard? This is a collection of ideas, so we have to decide if we like these together. If it's really a fundamental capability, it should be elevated to a separate standard. This should be its own standard because sometimes this planning can be the difference between a high quality teacher and an ineffective teacher. Some of this is crucial to survival for a beginning teacher.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the sub-standards, we really need to hit the point about collaborative planning. It doesn't necessarily need to be in the standard itself. This probably points back to principal standards. • Possible addition – include “teachers use student feedback as data” to plan instruction. Feedback from the students is one of the best things to help determine what's working and what isn't. Standard 6 is an attempt at capturing that, but perhaps it needs to come out in the sub-bullets of this. • Knowledge of Standards could go in Standard 1. Use of standards in planning goes in 4, knowledge of standards could go in 1. • Consensus is that knowledge and use of standards should be a bullet. • Keep knowledge of content standards in the language of the standard but not in the title.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity strategies and engaging all learners needs to be included • Not sure if in 5 or 4, but there's not reference to any cross-disciplinary approach. That might get us back to teaching in silos. That's a concern. Maybe it goes into planning. Or maybe in both places. Cross-curricular within a building and interdisciplinary within the classroom. This could be called out in a substandard • Says “develop deep understanding of content” and Standard 1 says “ensure mastery of content”. Need to be consistent with language.
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change “continually evaluate” to “continually improve”. This continuous improvement idea is also captured in Standard 9. Consensus to say “continually evaluate and improve”.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much. Are we going to have many sub-categories since we have so many aspects in this standard? • There's nothing about supporting the parents. Because of the demographics of students and families, they need that support. We need language about this two-way partnership. (NC Standards, “Teachers demonstrating leadership” standard suggested language). Definitely needs to be a sub-category. • Need to clarify what the teacher should be accountable. Need to wordsmith the language of the standard. We need to have a piece that addresses communication between teacher and families. • What is the difference between pulling it out as a standard and creating many sub-categories? There are 4 standards for initial teachers that we've compressed into standard 1. We needed to get to the right number of standards. If we start breaking out, then we have to break all of them out and we'd get to 20 standards. Each one of these has been compressed. The working group picked standards that fit together and combined them. Do the levels of coherence chosen by the working group resonate with the council? • It's important that we don't put the teacher in a role of a family social worker. We need to be clear about what the domain of the classroom teacher is. We need to keep the door open about communications. • What do we mean by “community”? • Teachers could provide resources for parents to get what they need to help the students. We just need to be very clear about the expectations. • We need to remember that different people play different roles in a school. We need to be cognizant of the collaboration with counselors and other school personnel.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording change – change “draws on” to “utilizes” or “includes” or something that’s more active.
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do we mean by “school community”? • The word “leadership” is nowhere in these standards. Proposal to include in this standard. If you’re going to have collaboration, you need to demonstrate leadership, model leadership for your students. That somehow got left out. • North Carolina had a good reference to leadership. We may want to consider it in terms of the sub-bullets/indicators • “Ethical behavior” should be a sub-standard. Doesn’t fit within the standard. It’s important, just doesn’t fit in the standard. You can’t suddenly surprise people by including it in the sub-standard without having it in the standard at all. We need to work on incorporating it into the standard somehow. • What does “elevating/enhancing the teaching profession” look like? Teachers taking a sense of ownership and responsibility for all the things we’ve talked about. It would, for example, mean teachers being active participants in developing curriculum materials. As a teacher, you see yourself as a broader profession, you do things to make your colleagues better teachers, contribute to the team effort in the building/district, willingness to contribute to the professional growth of your colleagues. The idea of “mentoring” was raised. For some, it is mentoring, but for others, this is exhibited in other ways. • The leadership issue feels more about the aspirational goals. It ought to be important for the teaching profession. • “Takes responsibility for and contributes to the teaching profession in a variety of ways, such as...” This captures the spirit of contributing. • Suggestion to change the name of this standard to “Professionalism”. • We want a standard that points to the professional growth of individual educators and the professional growth of the profession itself. • Do people have a problem with the word “leadership”? If it’s just “professionalism”, ethical behavior fits.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This standard corresponds to the 50% required measure. We could: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Cross out the last phrase “teacher uses evidence...”, because it’s a little redundant (in Standard 6). • We need to have a conversation about whether we are going to have a growth standard or just handle the 50% when we get to measurement and acknowledge that it’s different structurally (just 8 standards). • We do need to get an understanding of what outcomes we want to measure. • Without this standard, there’s a disconnect with the statute.

B. What other standards (if any) should be adopted to adequately reflect the values which have emerged during prior Council sessions? General issues to be covered in the standard will be sufficient.

- a. Order should be reconsidered.
- b. The critical dispositions idea needs to be considered. Where does it go?
- c. Proposed Standard:

d. Proposed Standard:

e. Proposed Standard: